DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 111 913 32 UD 015 468

AUTHOR	John, Thomas
TITLE	Evaluation of the ESEA Title I Program of the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, 1973-1974. Final Report.
INSTITUTION	Associate Control, Research and Analysis, Inc., Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	Bureau of Elementary and Secondary Education (DHEW/OE), Washington, D.C. Div. of Compensatory Education.; District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE	30 Nov 74
NOTE	353p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.76 HC-$18.40 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS	*Compensatory Education Programs; Cost Effectiveness; Cultural Enrichment; Disadvantaged Youth; Educationally Disadvantaged; Elementary Schools; Federal Programs; Parent Participation; Private Schools; *Program Effectiveness; *Program Evaluation; *Public Schools; Secondary Schools; Staff Improvement; Standardized Tests; Test Results
IDENTIFIERS	Competitive Partnership Program; *District of Columbia; Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I; ESEA Title I; Special Education Learning Centers

ABSTRACT

This evaluation determines program effectiveness based on the program's stated objectives in order to make recommendations to strengthen ESEA Title I programs, and to provide a data base that could be useful in decision-making and management. Data collected include both field data and previous evaluation data. Major findings and recommendations in the areas of test results, public elementary schools, public secondary schools, nonpublic schools, cost effectiveness of the Competitive Partnership Programs and the Special Education Learning Center, staff development, parental involvement, and special projects are given in detail. ESEA Title I programs of the public and nonpublic schools of D.C. are stated to meet or exceed their objectives in raising achievement levels of students. The concept of staff development designated as the total team approach is considered to be excellent but not practiced widely. The parental involvement component of the program is found to be moving in the direction of increased involvement of both parents and other community people. Appendixes include questionnaires and interview schedules used in the evaluation. (AM)

ACRA
ASSOCIATE CONTROL, RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS, INC.

ED111913

EVALUATION OF THE ESEA TITLE I PROGRAM OF THE PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
1973 - 1974

FINAL REPORT

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF
EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Submitted To:

DIVISION OF RESEARCH AND EVALUATION
PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
Washington, D.C.

(Under Contract No. 0931-AA-NS-N-4-GA)

Submitted By:

ASSOCIATE CONTROL, RESEARCH AND ANALYSIS, INC.
1000 Vermont Avenue, N.W. - Suite 309
Washington, D.C. 20005

Thomas John, Ph.D., Principal Investigator

November 30, 1974

UD 015 468

1000 VERMONT AVENUE, N.W./WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005/(202) 347-9100

2/3

PROJECT STAFF

This project was carried out with the earnest and sincere efforts of a group of hardworking researchers:

Anne O. Hughes, Ph.D.
Senior Research Scientist

Isadore Goldberg, Ph.D.
Senior Research Scientist

William L. Tutman
Project Director

Ellenor K. Stafford
Research Associate

Thomas Heatley
Research Associate

George T. George
Research Assistant

Patricia A. Highsmith
Research Assistant

Judith Gorfkle
Research Assistant

M. T. Kurian
Research Assistant

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The ACRA evaluation team is indebted to many people in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia for their cooperation and assistance in the conduct of this study. In particular, we wish to thank all of the parents, aides, teachers, non-teaching professionals, principals and other administrators who took the time to complete questionnaires for the evaluation and who often participated also in follow-up interviews as well.

In addition, the team would like to extend special thanks to Mrs. Anne W. Pitts, Executive Director of the Title I Project for the Public Schools of the District of Columbia, and to her staff members for their helpful assistance.

Finally, the team wishes most especially to thank Dr. Mildred Cooper, Assistant Superintendent for Research and Evaluation, for her meticulous and careful attention to requests for various types of information, such as needed background materials and achievement results, and for her assistance in making arrangements for field visits. Her staff was most cooperative in meeting all requests; and in this connection, the team is most appreciative for the assistance provided by Mrs. June Bland and Mr. Earl Hunter.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

Acknowledgements

Table of Contents

List of Tables

List of Figures

Executive Summary

I. Introduction
- Purpose of Evaluation 1
- Evaluation Design 4
- Sampling 7
- Instrumentation 10
- Data Interpretation and Analysis 12

II. Public School Standardized Test Results 15

III. Programs in the Public Elementary Schools 34

IV. Secondary Schools 83

V. Programs in the Non-Public Schools 106

VI. Cost Effectiveness Analysis of the Competitive Partnership Programs 121

VII. Programs in the Special Education Learning Centers 170

VIII. Staff Development 180

IX. Parental Involvement Program 190

X. Special Projects and Cultural Enrichment Program 223

Appendices

A - 1. Principals' Questionnaire
A - 2. Classroom & Resource Teachers' Questionnaire
A - 3. PAC Questionnaire
A - 4. Non-Teaching Professionals' Questionnaire
A - 5. Non-Teaching Para-Professionals' Questionnaire
B - 1. Classroom & Resource Teachers' Interview
B - 2. Principals' Interview
B - 3. Special Education Staff Interview
B - 4. Administrators' Interview

LIST OF TABLES

I - 1 Number and Percentage of Final Samples by Type of Population and Instruments

II - 1 Public School Reading Test Results for Title I Students by Grade - Grade Equivalent Scores

II - 2 Public School Mathematics Test Results for Title I Students by Grade - Grade Equivalent Scores

II - 3 Metropolitan Readiness Test Results - First Grade Public School Students Tested in September 1973

II - 4 Public School Students - Reading Tests: Percentage of Title I and Non-Title I Students, Percent Matched and Unmatched Records and Percent Loss of Students from Pretest to Posttest by Grade

II - 5 Public School Students - Mathematics Tests: Percentage of Title I and Non-Title I Students, Percent Matched and Unmatched Records and Percent Loss of Students from Pretest to Posttest by Grade

II - 6 Public School Test Results - Comparison of Matched and Unmatched Pretest Results of Title I Students

II - 7 The Tests Utilized by Elementary School Title I Classroom Teachers During FY 1974

II - 8 The Frequency and Percentage of the Tests Utilized by Elementary School Mathematics Resource Teachers

III - 1 Outstanding Features of the Title I Program Reported by Elementary School Personnel

III - 2 Problems Encountered with the Title I Program Reported by Public Elementary School Personnel

III - 3 Recommendations for the Title I Program Made by Public Elementary School Personnel

III - 4 Correlation of Problems and Recommendations Reported by Public Elementary School Personnel

III - 5 Major Strengths of the FY 1974 Title I Program as Reported by Elementary School and Secondary School Principals

(List of Tables - continued)

III - 6 Problems of the FY 1974 Title I Program as Reported by Elementary and Secondary School Principals

III - 7 Recommendations for the FY 1975 Title I Program as Suggested by Elementary and Secondary School Principals

III - 8 Ratings Given by Public Elementary School Principals to Various Program Areas

III - 9 Difficult Experiences Reported by Public School Principals with the Title I Program

III - 10 Administrative Problems Encountered by Public School Principals with the Title I Program

III - 11 Most Significant and Positive Experiences Encountered in Title I by Public School Principals

III - 12 Advantages of Title I Programs as Reported by Public School Teachers

III - 13 Disadvantages of Title I Program as Reported by Public School Teachers

III - 14 Background Information on Teachers

III - 15 Professional Data

III - 16 Certification

III - 17 Reading Competitive Partnership Used

III - 18 Arrival and Starting Dates

III - 19 Materials Used in Addition to Reading Competitive Partnership

III - 20 Teacher Ratings of Reading Competitive Partnership Programs

III - 21 Teaching Activities in Reading

III - 22 Library Visits

III - 23 Use of Mathematics Competitive Partnerships

III - 24 Arrival and Starting Dates of Mathematics Competitive Partnerships

III - 25 Other Mathematics Materials Available

(List of Tables - continued)

III - 26 Teacher Ratings of Mathematics CP Programs

III - 27 Teaching Activities in Mathematics

III - 28 Time Spent by Non-Teaching Professionals Working with Title I

III - 29 How Non-Teaching Professionals Spend Their Time

III - 30 How Para-Professionals Spent Their Time

III - 31 How Non-Teaching Professionals Spend Their Time and How They Should Spend Their Time

III - 32 Student Problems as Shown by Non-Teaching Professionals and Para-Professionals

III - 33 Percentage and Number of Non-Teaching Professionals Providing Services to Title I Students

III - 34 Adequacy of Follow-Through Provided to Students

III - 35 Ratings of Staff Cooperation as given by Non-Teaching Professionals and Para-Professionals

IV - 1 Number and Percentage of Secondary School Resource Teachers by Average Length of Experience

IV - 2 Number and Percentage of Teachers Using Different Diagnostic Tests in Title I Secondary Schools

IV - 3 Number and Percentage of Teachers Using Supplemental Tests

IV - 4 Student Grouping for Different Instructional Activities as Reported by Resource Teachers

IV - 5 Areas of Student Learning Difficulties as Reported by Resource Teachers

IV - 6 Major Strengths of the Title I Program in Secondary Schools as Reported by Principals and Resource Teachers

IV - 7 Major Problems in Title I Schools as Reported by Principals, Resource Teachers, Professionals, and Para-Professionals

IV - 8 Secondary School Reading and Math Standardized Test Results for 1973-1974

(List of Tables - continued)

V - 1 Data Sources for Non-Public School Analysis

V - 2 Budget for Non-Public Schools

V - 3 Non-Public School Reading Test Results - Grade Equivalents

V - 4 Non-Public School Mathematics Test Results - Grade Equivalents

VI - 1 Annualized Per Student Costs for Competitive Partnership Reading Programs

VI - 2 Reading - Results of Competitive Partnership Standardized Test Analysis for 1972-1973 and 1973-1974 by Grade

VI - 3 Summary Profile of Competitive Partnership Reading Programs

VI - 4 Annualized Per Student Costs for Competitive Partnership Mathematics Programs

VI - 5 Mathematics - Results of Competitive Partnership Standardized Test Analysis for 1972-73 and 1973-74 by Grade

VI - 6 Summary Profile of Competitive Partnership Mathematics Programs

VI - 7 Cost Analysis of the Competitive Partnership Programs - Reading Programs

VI - 8 Cost Analysis of the Competitive Partnership Programs - Mathematics Programs

VI - 9 Annualized Costs and Per Student Costs - Reading

VI - 10 Annualized Costs and Per Student Costs - Mathematics

VI - 11 Summary of Competitive Partnership Analysis of Reading Test Results by Grade

VI - 12 Summary of Competitive Partnership Analysis of Mathematics Test Results by Grade

VI - 13 Competitive Partnership Sample Data for Reading and Mathematics - Number of Teachers Matched from Building Profiles and Standardized Test Records

VI - 14 Reading Competitive Partnership Analysis - Grade 1

(List of Tables - continued)

VI - 15 Competitive Partnership Analysis - Grade Equivalent Reading Scores for Grade 2

VI - 16 Competitive Partnership Analysis - Grade Equivalent Reading Scores for Grade 3

VI - 17 Mathematics Competitive Partnership Analysis - Grade 1

VI - 18 Competitive Partnership Analysis - Grade Equivalent Mathematics Scores for Grade 2

VI - 19 Competitive Partnership Analysis - Grade Equivalent Mathematics Scores for Grade 3

VII - 1 Special Education Learning Centers and Feeder Schools

VIII - 1 Title I Staff Development Activities During 1973-74 Academic Year

VIII - 2 Percentage of Title I Teachers Familiar with the "Total Team Approach"

IX - 1 Positive Results of the Local PAC as Reported by Public School Principals

IX - 2 Involvement of the Local PAC in Decision Making as Reported by the Public School Principals

IX - 3 Methods for Recruiting Parents for PAC as Reported by Public School Principals

IX - 4 Public School Principals' Ratings of PAC from the Principals' Questionnaire

IX - 5 Suggestions for Change for PAC Reported by Public School Principals

IX - 6 Age Distribution of Parent Members of the Parent Advisory Council

IX - 7 Highest Grade Completed - Reported by Parent Members of PAC

IX - 8 PAC Membership

IX - 9 PAC Office Holders

IX - 10 Time of PAC Membership

(List of Tables - continued)

IX - 11 Number of PAC Meetings Attended by Members

IX - 12 Method of Selection as a PAC Member

IX - 13 Information Received by Parents from Title I

IX - 14 Cooperation of School Personnel Rated by PAC Members

IX - 15 PAC Participation in Decision Making

IX - 16 Regional or City-Wide PAC Participation in Decision Making

IX - 17 Cooperation of Title I Staff and Other School Officials with Regional/City-Wide PAC Members in Various Activities

IX - 18 What Title I Means to PAC Members

IX - 19 Parents' Views of Whether Their School is Doing a Good Job in Teaching

IX - 20 Parents' Views of Whether Their School is Doing a Good Job in Providing Various Services

IX - 21 PAC Members' Perceptions of Community Interest Based on Three Questions

IX - 22 Parent-Child Interaction Regarding Education

IX - 23 PAC Members' Recommendations for Changes in Title I Services

X - 1 Number and Percentage of Students Participating in the Title I Career Development Program

X - 2 Specific Project Offerings and Number of Participants in the Program at Garnet-Patterson Community School

LIST OF FIGURES

I - 1 The CIPP Evaluation Model

I - 2 Levels of Decision Making According to CIPP Model

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The general purpose of the Title I Evaluation of the public schools of the District of Columbia was to determine the effectiveness of the program based on its stated objectives. Corollary purposes were two-fold: (1) to make recommendations for strengthening the Title I program for fiscal year 1975-76, and (2) to provide a data base that would be useful in decision-making and management.

The specific objectives were:

1. To identify program elements, terminal objectives and target population of the following FY 74 ESEA Title I program components: elementary reading, and mathematics (grades K-3) and the Secondary Reinforcement Learning Center (grade 7).

2. To assess the performance of children participating in the components cited above relative to the stated terminal program objectives.

3. To evaluate the cost effectiveness of the three competitive reading and mathematics programs in operation during FY 1974.

4. To describe and analyze the roles of the various program components involved relative to determination of policies and procedures utilized in the selection of the target population.

5. To analyze the impact of the FY 1974 ESEA Title I program within four categories:

   (a) Analysis of the performance, including the use of the results from standardized tests, of Title I students.

(b) Description and analysis of ESEA Title I supportive services.

(c) Assessment of the impact of various roles played by the instructional and supportive personnel, and resulting learning environments relative to the promotion of positive and successful student performance.

6. To analyze and report findings and recommendations on the Total Learning Center component of FY 74 Title I program in public and nonpublic schools.

7. To describe and evaluate the operation and effectiveness of the staff development component of the FY 74 Title I program.

8. To analyze the overall effectiveness of the FY 74 programs with recommendations for the FY 75 Title I program.

9. To recommend specific revisions and supplemental components as may be needed for incorporation into the FY 1975 Title I program for the PSDC.

The CIPP model evaluation design developed by the National Study Commission on Evaluation of the Evaluation Center of the Ohio State University has been used for the study. The design has enough flexibility to make proper assessment at the Context, Input, Process and Product levels of the Title I program.

Data collection was done through questionnaires, interviews, observations, and the standardized test results provided by the Division of Research and Evaluation of PSDC. In addition to these field data, the evaluation team made use of the secondary data that was available through previous Title I Evaluation Reports and other documents.

The field data were collected from principals, classroom teachers, reading and mathematics resource teachers, Title I administrators, non-teaching professionals, para-professionals, parents, and other advisory Council members. The Division of Research and Evaluation of P.S.D.C. arranged for data collection from the schools.

The study has concentrated on all the program areas of Title I and the report describes the findings and recommendations in detail. Some of the major findings and recommendations are in the following areas: test results, public elementary schools, public secondary schools, non-public schools, cost effectiveness of the Competitive Partnership programs, Special Education Learning Center, staff development, parental involvement, special projects, and other general recommendations. Major findings and recommendations are given in this section.

Standardized Test Results

The effectiveness of the Title I program is measured, in part, in terms of the gain scores in achievement in the two primary target areas of reading and mathematics. Grade equivalent scores are useful in showing the gains in achievement resulting from the Title I program, and the extent to which Title I students are achieving at grade level at the beginning and end of the school year (from pretests and posttests). The results below show the grade equivalent gain scores for reading and mathematics by grade, for an eight month period.

GAIN SCORE GRADE EQUIVALENTS

Grade	Public Schools		Non-Public Schools	
	Reading	Mathematics	Reading	Mathematics
2	1.0	0.9	1.1	0.1
3	0.8	1.1	0.8	0.3
4	-	-	1.3	1.2
5	-	-	0.8	0.9
6	-	-	0.6	0.8
7	0.7	0.8	1.1	1.2
8	-	-	0.5	0.9

Gains in reading and mathematics for public school students meet the Title I objectives -- one year gain for a comparable school period -- in every case except for reading in grade 7. (An eight month grade equivalent gain or higher is the expected gain for the eight month period between the pretest and posttests.) Gain scores for non-public school students vary a great deal by grade, with results meeting Title I objectives in reading in grades 2,3,4,5, and 7 (6 of 8) and with results meeting Title I objectives in mathematics in grades 4 through 8 (6 of 8).

Clearly, in most grades, the Title I program has succeeded in meeting or exceeding its objectives in raising the achievement levels of Title I students. Particular attention, however, should be given by the public and non-public schools alike to those grades in which the objectives were not met, and to improving the teaching of those students who were below average in their gain scores.

The extent to which Title I students are brought up to grade level is shown by the difference in average pretest and posttest grade equivalent scores and the grade level of the students. The results below show that deficits at the beginning of the year (pretest) tend to increase by grade.

AVERAGE ACHIEVEMENT BELOW GRADE LEVEL IN MONTHS AT THE BEGINNING (PRETEST) AND END (POST-TEST) OF 1973-1974

GRADE	PUBLIC SCHOOLS				NON PUBLIC SCHOOLS			
	READING		MATHEMATICS		READING		MATHEMATICS	
	Pretest	Post-test	Pretest	Post-test	Pretest	Post-test	Pretest	Post-test
	Difference		Difference		Difference		Difference	
1	---	.3	---	.9	---	---	---	---
2	.6	.4	.5	.4	.5	.2	.4	1yr 2mo
3	.7	.7	.6	.3	.9	.9	.5	1 year
4	---	---	---	---	1 year	.6	1yr 1mo	7mo
5	---	---	---	---	1yr 4mo	1yr 4mo	1yr 3mo	1yr 2mo
6	---	---	---	---	1yr 4mo	1yr 6mo	1yr 4mo	1yr 4mo
7	2yr 3mo	2yr 4mo	2yr 3mo	2yr 3mo	2yr 7mo	2yr 4mo	1yr 7mo	1yr 3mo
8	---	---	---	---	1yr 9mo	2yr 2mo	1yr 9mo	1yr 8mo

The reasons for this increasing deficit are not entirely clear and do not necessarily reflect negatively upon the effectiveness of the Title I program efforts. However, it is a matter that requires further attention.

First, Title I selects only those students each year who are in eligible schools and who have the greatest educational need measured in terms of test scores below the 50th percentile. As a result, the same group of students would not necessarily be represented from year to year because those who "catch up" to grade level will not be eligible in the succeeding year. Second, the students may also be different from year to year because of the high rate of mobility and school transfers in some segments of the economically disadvantaged student population served by Title I. Third, even if many of the same students are represented, deficits at the beginning of the school year may be due to the forgetting that typically takes place during the summer vacation. Although Title I operates a summer program, information was not made available for analysis (nor was it a requirement of this contract) to analyze results for the summer program.

Therefore, it is recommended that: (1) The Title I office consider raising the objectives for reading and mathematics to a level that would bring Title I students closer to grade level. This means that goals in reading and mathematics should be higher the higher the school grade. More intensive work with students in higher grades will be required to achieve this goal.

(2) A strategy should be devised for students from highly mobile families -- those who transfer schools frequently. A more intensive study is needed of their learning problems as well as of the problems schools and teachers encounter in helping these students.

(3) A longitudinal and comparative study should be made over a three to four year period to determine the effect summer school participation has on "catching up" to grade level; and the impact of transfer students on the school, teaching approaches, and on the achievement of the students.

(4) Results obtained for grade one in the public schools show that only about 50 percent of the students were selected as Title I students while more than 80 percent of students in grades 2 and 3 were selected. Considering the posttest deficits at the end of grade 1 and the need to continue to focus upon the prevention of learning problems, it is recommended that the score on the Metropolitan Readiness Test used to select students for Title I be changed from the 50th percentile to the 75th percentile.

Detailed results and recommendations are presented in Chapter II (Public Schools) and in Chapter V (Non-Public Schools).

Cost Effectiveness of the Competitive Partnership Programs in Reading and Mathematics

The cost effectiveness analysis was carried out for grades 1 - 3 for the programs in reading and mathematics for four publishers as follows:

Publisher	Reading	Mathematics
D. C. Heath	X	X
Random House	X	X
McGraw-Hill	X	
Addison-Wesley		X

This cost effectiveness analysis is the second year of a three year testing program that started in 1972-73 and will be completed in 1974-75. The data in this report (Chapter VI) includes costs, standardized test results and other variables analyzed within the framework of the CIPP (Context, Input, Process, and Product) model. In addition, standardized test results for 1972-73, obtained from the Office of Evaluation are also presented.

Although some clear-cut trends are beginning to emerge, the third year of cost effectiveness analysis is clearly needed in order to reach decisions that will enable the Title I office to make decisions that will maximize the usefullness of these programs to Title I teachers and students.

The third year of cost effectiveness analysis is needed, in part, because not all programs have had an equal period in the competition. In reading, the Random House programs appear to be operating at a distinct disadvantage. Random House reading started late in the Competitive Partnership program, and, as a consequence, many teachers were starting to use their materials well into the 1973-74 school year. In addition, Random House staff development started later than D. C. Heath and McGraw Hill.

Although D. C. Heath is the least expensive reading program ($5.34 annualized per student cost) and Random House is the most expensive ($11.94 annualized per student cost), McGraw-Hill reading runs a close second to D. C. Heath with $6.94 annualized per student cost.

In contrast, the standardized tests used as the measures of effectiveness, do not show clear and consistent trends. In 1973-74, McGraw-Hill reading in Grade 2 had a gain score that was two months (in grade equivalent) higher than the other two Competitive Partnership programs; Random House in Grade 1 surpassed the other two by two months (grade equivalent); and in grade 3 there was no difference among the three Competitive Partnership reading programs in tested gain grade equivalent scores. As shown in Chapter VI, the results were different in 1972-73. These results show the continuing promise of all three Competitive Partnership reading programs, even though the Random House programs need to demonstrate some clear advantages in view of their relatively high costs.

In mathematics, Addison Wesley was in its first year in the Competitive Partnership, and Random House compared with D. C. Heath, again had a late start. Random House mathematics also had fewer staff members trained in the use of this program on a per student basis. A third year of the cost effectiveness analysis will give all thr[illegible]blisher programs an equitable testing period.

The results for Competitive Partnership mathematics programs show that D. C. Heath is the lease expensive with $3.06 annualized per student costs. Costs for Random House ($5.64 per student) and Addison Wesley ($5.89 per student) are about 90 percent higher than D. C. Heath, but are quite close to one another.

Results of the standardized tests used to measure effectiveness also show an advantage of one month in grade equivalent scores in Grades 2 and 3 for D. C. Heath compared with its competitors. However, Addison Wesley achieved the highest results in Grade 1 -- two months higher than D. C. Heath and one month higher than Random House in grade equivalent scores. Given an equal competitive opportunity, the outcome in 1974-75 might change. However, considering their higher costs, Random House and Addison Wesley mathematics programs will need to show some clear cut advantages.

In carrying out the Competitive Partnership program for 1974-75, it is recommended that the Title I office give immediate attention to a change in procedures that involves the redistribution of programs to enable 20 to 30 classrooms to use combinations of two programs in reading and in mathematics. In carrying out the Competitive Partnership, apparently in all but a few cases one program was distributed to each teacher. However, questionnaires and interviews indicate that a number of teachers (unknown, perhaps, to the Title I office) were using several programs and were capitalizing on the strengths in one to compensate for weaknesses in another. The use of two programs, when one is better able to serve the specific teaching requirements of the teachers and the individual learning needs and learning styles of the student, is consistent with the philosophy of the Total Learning Center approach to individualized instruction.

If the Title I office can, during 1974-75, set up "combined" program users, the cost effectiveness analysis should evaluate the outcomes for "combination" and "single" program users in terms of advantages for individualizing instruction and test results. This analysis, properly conducted, will also show how to capitalize on the investment in materials of Competitive Partnership publishers who are not finally selected.

Details of these recommendations are presented in Chapter VI.

Staff Development

(1) The present concept of staff development for the Title I staff is an excellent one. It was designated as the "total team approach", and referred to the involvement of teachers, principals, aides, and other staff members. The evaluation team in their survey was able to find only 15 percent of classroom teachers, 17 percent of elementary reading and mathematics resource teachers, and five percent of secondary resource teachers familiar with the "total team approach". They have acknowledged that the concept has not been practiced as widely as they would like to see it practiced.

It is, therefore, recommended that special effort should be made to practice the "total team approach" by emphasizing its importance to all principals, teachers, and staff at the initial Title I meeting at the beginning of the school year.

(2) Almost all the principals have pointed out that the announcement for staff development activities often reached them after the scheduled activities were over. In spite of their desire to send their teachers and aides to the staff development activities, it was too late for them to do so.

It is, therefore, recommended that the Staff Development office should plan a yearly schedule for its activities for the coming year. The schedule should be placed in the principal's hands before the classes begin in September. In addition to the yearly schedule, it will be helpful to have a quarterly or monthly calendar of events, with brief descriptions of the nature of the staff development planned.

(3) Although Title I has provision to give special on-the-job training, it has no provision to pay for substitute teachers. Consequently, many good programs arranged by the Staff Development office were poorly attended. Many teachers had to cover two or three classes at times in order to release the teachers of those classes for such programs. The practice, we feel, is unfair to the teachers as well as to the pupils involved.

It is, therefore, recommended that special provision should be made to hire temporary help when the teachers and aides have to attend staff development programs so that those attending will derive the maximum benefit from the programs.

(4) There is a tremendous need for a variety of staff development sessions. There should be more reading and mathematics workshops for elementary classroom teachers, in addition to the ones conducted for the resource

teachers. They should be held in sequence, and scheduled carefully so that the same people can grow with the program by attending regularly at a time that is convenient to them. Efforts should be made to introduce training programs for teachers in the construction, use and interpretation of diagnostic and prescriptive classroom tests.

Parental Involvement

The Parental Involvement Component of the Title I program should continue to give attention to the strengthening of local Parent Advisory Councils through efforts in neighborhoods to broaden the base of parents involved in the schools. Even though the level of parental involvement was already a very strong point in some schools, there should be increased involvement of parents and other community people in the Title I program in many other schools. The Parental Involvement program is moving in this direction and support for this effort should be maintained.

Two strategies now being employed in Title I should be given further support. Personal contacts by school representatives (principals, program assistants, pupil personnel workers, teachers and other staff) and by PAC members will help in getting and keeping more parents involved in school activities. Letters and brochures do not seem to be as effective as personal contacts.

The Parent Volunteer program should be expanded. Additional stipends for those parents who are deeply involved in Title I activities will be a great incentive for them to continue with their efforts, and will attract others into similar roles.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Evaluation

The general purpose of the evaluative study of the fiscal year 1974 ESEA Title I program in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia (PSDC) has been to determine the effectiveness of this program based on its stated objectives. Corollary purposes of this study were: (1) to make recommendations for strengthening the Title I program for fiscal years 1975 and 1976; and (2) to provide a data base that would be useful in program decision-making and management. Derived from these objectives and the Request for Proposal: Statement of Work, nine objectives were developed for and used in the evaluative study for fiscal year 1974. These objectives were:

1. To identify program elements, terminal objectives and target population of the following FY 74 ESEA Title I program components: elementary reading, and mathematics (grades K-3) and the Secondary Reinforcement Learning Center (grade 7).
2. To assess the performance of children participating in the components cited above relative to the stated terminal program objectives.
3. To evaluate the cost effectiveness of the three competitive reading programs in operation during FY 1974.
4. To describe and analyze the roles of the various program components involved relative to determination of policies and procedures utilized in the selection of the target population.
5. To analyze the impact of the FY 1974 ESEA Title I program within four categories:

(a) Analysis of the performance, including the use of the results from standardized tests, of Title I and eligible non-Title I students within each Title I school and on a city-wide basis.

(b) Description and analysis of ESEA Title I supportive services.

(c) Assessment of the impact of various roles played by the instructional and supportive personnel (regular classroom teachers, Title I teachers, principals, central administrators, program assistants, pupil personnel aides, instructional aides, clinical services, health aides, social workers, school psychologists, speech therapists and other non-teaching staff) and resulting learning environments relative to the promotion of positive and successful student performance.

(d) Comparison of attendance rates of low income children in the Title I schools with those of similar children in the non-Title I schools.

6. To analyze and report findings and recommendations on the Total Learning Center component of FY 74 Title I program in public and non-public schools.

7. To describe and evaluate the operation and effectiveness of the staff development component of the FY 74 Title I program.

8. To analyze the overall effectiveness of the FY 74 programs with recommendations for the FY 75 Title I program.

9. To recommend specific revisions and supplemental components as may be needed for incorporation into the FY 1975 Title I program for the PSDC.

In presenting the final report of the evaluation conducted during the last eight months, it should be emphasized that the findings, interpretations, and recommendations contained within it are intended to provide constructive bases for the continuing improvement of the ESEA Title I program in the PSDC. In this connection, the evaluation team has been fully aware throughout the duration of the study of the kinds of problems that occur when there are too many children and young people to be served and too limited funds with which to serve them. That is, the task of planning and operationalizing a Title I program in a large urban school system has always been more than a matter of sound educational decision-making -- although this aspect of the task is difficult enough in and of itself. This task has also required the practical recognition of the aspect of community and political realities as well. And the two aspects have not always been complementary. In preparing this report, the evaluation team has kept both aspects in mind.

The remainder of this chapter presents brief descriptions of the evaluation design, sampling, instrumentation, and data collection and data analysis. Other chapters in the order of their presentation are focused on:

Public School Standardized Test Results
Programs in the Public Elementary Schools
Secondary Schools
Programs in the Non-Public Schools
Cost Effectiveness Analysis of the Competitive Partnership Programs
Programs in the Special Education Learning Centers
Staff Development
Parental Involvement Program
Special Projects and Cultural Enrichment Program

Evaluation Design

After a thorough examination of several evaluation models, the evaluation team was convinced that the CIPP model involving the evaluation at the Context, Input, Process and Product levels was the best for evaluating the Title I Program of the D.C. Public Schools. The model was developed by the National Study Commission on Evaluation headed by Dr. Daniel L. Stufflebeam, Ohio State University, and recommended to be used for any in-depth evaluation of programs where decision-making is of top priority. (See Figure I-1).

Using the model, the Title I programs were examined at all four levels of their operation. The operations Context needs identification and assessment, and the contextual problems were carefully examined through various data sources. By describing individually and in relevant perspectives the major sub-systems of the context were studied. Proper efforts were made to compare actual and intended inputs and outputs of the Title I program activities and analyze possible causes of discrepancies between actualities and intentions.

The design has set the stage to identify and assess systems capabilities and available input strategies and designs for implementing the strategies. This was done by describing and analyzing the resources (human and material), solution strategies, procedural design for relevance, feasibility, and economy in the course of action to be taken. Data from secondary sources as well as certain data from the primary sources were used for the input evaluation.

Concentrated efforts were made to analyze the process used for the implementation of the program and the allocated resources. In doing so, the evaluation design has revealed those areas where any procedural defects are prevailing, and enabled to suggest ways and means of maintaining a record of procedural events and activities. Potential procedural barriers have been identified and cautioned against them.

Figure I - 1

THE CIPP EVALUATION MODEL
A Classification Scheme of Strategies for Evaluating Educational Change

The Strategies

	Context Evaluation	Input Evaluation	Process Evaluation	Product Evaluation
OBJECTIVE	To define the operation context, to identify & assess needs in the context, and to identify & delineate problems underlying the needs.	To identify and assess system capabilities, available input strategies, and designs for implementing the strategies.	To identify or predict, in process, defects in the procedural design or its implementation, and to maintain a record of procedural events and activities.	To relate outcome information to objectives and to context, input, and process information.
METHOD	By describing individually and in relevant perspectives the major sub-systems of the context; by comparing actual and intended inputs & outputs of the sub-systems; & by analyzing possible causes of discrepancies between actualities & intentions.	By describing & analyzing available human & material resources, solution strategies, & procedural designs for relevance, feasibility & economy in the course of action to be taken.	By monitoring the activity's potential procedural barriers and remaining alert to unanticipated ones.	By defining operationally & measuring criteria associated with the objectives, by comparing these measurements with predetermined standards or comparative bases, & by interpreting the outcome in terms of recorded input & process information.
RELATION TO DECISION-MAKING IN THE CHANGE PROCESS	For deciding upon the setting to be served, the goals associated with meeting needs & the objectives associated with solving problems, i.e., for planning needed changes	For selecting sources of support, solution strategies, and procedural designs, i.e., for programing change activities.	For implementing and refining the program design and procedure, i.e., for effecting process control.	For deciding to continue, terminate, modify or re-focus a change activity, & for linking the activity to other major phases of the change process, i.e., for evolving change activities.

The CIPP model helped to related product information to Title I objectives and to context, input, and process information. Each criteria associated with objectives was identified and compared with predetermined standards on comparative bases and by interpreting the outcome in terms of recorded input and process information.

The design has provided adequate flexibility to the evaluation team to make the necessary recommendations at all four levels (Context, Input, Process, and Product). The model has been used to organize the various Title I programs such as Special Projects, reading and math programs, and staff development for meaningful data analysis. It has provided adequate information relative to the overall operation of the Title I program in D.C. schools and its effectiveness insofar as the achievement of the children is concerned.

The evaluation design outlined above identifies four basic decisions that were made about the total Title I program. These decisions are concerned with the goals of the program and the means for achieving these ends. There are decisions to be made at the beginning, middle, and end of the program according to the projected program efforts. They are classified as planning decisions, structuring decisions, implementing decisions, and recycling decisions.

Figure I - 2

LEVELS OF DECISION MAKING ACCORDING TO CIPP MODEL

Planning Decisions (Context)	Structuring Decisions (Input)
Implementing Decisions (Process)	Recycling Decisions (Product)

Sampling

In selecting the necessary sample, the evaluation team has exercised extreme care so that the selected samples will be representative of the population they were drawn from. Stratified random sampling techniques were used for selecting the sample. In order to make the selection unbiased, first of all, the elementary schools were classified into three major categories according to the percentage of Title I students in each school. They were:

a) High Concentration (75% - 100%)

b) Medium Concentration (50% - 74%)

c) Low Concentration (Below 50%)

Schools with high concentration of Title I children were given the top priority both for interview and observation. The random selection from each of the three groups made it possible to have larger samples from high concentration schools and proportionately smaller samples from the medium and low concentration schools. No concentration figure was used for secondary and non-public schools.

The major population groups from which the samples were selected are given below: (See Table I - 1)

1. Principals - These are the chief administrators of the Title I schools that are receiving Title I supplementary services for the selected students. Because of the strategic role that they play in Title I schools, all eight of them (100%) have been selected for personal interview and questionnaire. All but four of the interviews have been conducted as scheduled during the months of May and June, 1974. The four missed were due to scheduling problems the Division of Research and Evaluation Office was faced with.

Table I - 1

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE* OF FINAL SAMPLES BY TYPE OF POPULATION AND INSTRUMENTS

		Principals	Classroom Teachers	RESOURCE TEACHERS		Para Pro-fessionals	Non-Tea-ching Staff	PAC	Adminis-trative Staff	Special-ized Staff
				Reading	Mathe-matics					
QUESTIONNAIRE	Elementary	44 62.85%	487 52.87%	65 100%	65 100%	301 92.61%	48 36.09%	108 43.72%	- -	- -
	Junior High	11 68.75%	- -	8 50%	8 50%	25 78.12%	10 45.5 %	7 31.81%	- -	- -
	Non-Public	3 37.5 %	- -	5 62.5%	5 62.5%	1 16.67%	- -	1 12.5%	- -	- -
	SUB-TOTAL	58 (58%)	487 (52.87%)	78 (87.64%)	78 (87.64%)	327 61.47%	58 (35.58%)	116 (42.96%)	- -	- -
INTERVIEW	Elementary	61 93.84%	89 100%	89 100%	89 100%	25 50%	15 60%	- -	10 55.5%	15 75%
	Junior High	16 100%	- -	12 75%	8 50%	- -	5 100%	15 75%	5 100%	- -
	Non-Public	7 87.5%	- -	5 62.5%	4 50%	10 62.5%	4 50%	5 50%	2 100%	- -
	SUB-TOTAL	84 (94.38%)	89 (100%)	106 (93.8%)	101 (89.38%)	35 (53.03%)	24 (63.15%)	20 66.6%	17 62.96%	15 75%

OBSERVATION	ELEMENTARY	JUNIOR HIGH	NON-PUBLIC
	25 38.46%	5 31.25%	8 100%

---

* The percentages are based on the actual number of instruments administered over different population categories.

2. Classroom and Resource Teachers - One classroom teacher from every elementary school was selected by their respective principals to be interviewed. In addition to that, every classroom teacher who has Title I children in their class was given a questionnaire to respond (see Appendix). Thus, 65 (13.5%) of the elementary classroom teachers, 65 (100%) reading resource teachers, and 65 (100%) math resource teachers from elementary schools were interviewed. All the reading and math resource teachers from secondary and non-public schools who could have been scheduled were interviewed and their instructional centers were observed. Their number came to 26.

3. Administrators - About 25 Title I officials who direct and coordinate the overall activities of the Title I program in D.C. Schools were scheduled to be interviewed during the summer months. Out of the 25 only 15 (60%) were actually interviewed as some of the previously scheduled interviews had to be cancelled due to personal problems of varying nature.

4) Non-Teaching Professionals - Questionnaires were sent out to non-teaching professionals to find out the nature of services they have rendered to the Title I children. These professionals are psychologists, pupil personnel workers, speech therapists, aduiologists and clinical service personnel. A small sample of 20 people (10%) were interviewed

from this group.

5) Para-professionals - Support staff such as Educational Aides, Health Aides, and Program Assistants were selected for questionnaire survey. Altogether 100 were surveyed by questionnaire and 60 (60%) responded. Twenty (20%) paraprofessionals were also interviewed during the study.

6) Parent Advisory Council - 116 Parent Advisory Council (PAC) members were selected to administer a specially developed questionnaire and another 20 (66.6%) for an on-the-spot interview. They were successfully completed as scheduled. In addition to PAC, a limited number (50) of Community Workers were also surveyed by the same questionnaire and the data collected from them are also included in the final analysis.

These samples were selected on a stratified random basis and all the necessary precautions were taken to avoid any possible sampling error. All samples were selected in close cooperation with the Division of Research and Evalution Office of the D.C. Public Schools in order to assure that the actual population was treated in a random unbiased manner.

Instrumentation

The CIPP model evaluation design used for the study gave sufficient flexibility in the selection and use of instruments for this evaluation. (A complete listing of instruments are given as Appendices). The model has allowed t he use of some type of instrument for different populations and different instruments on the same population. For example, questionniares were used for collecting data from all samples but one, and most of the samples selected were subjected to both questionnaires and interview and, in many instances, an informal observation was also conducted as part of data collection. Whenever more than one instrument was used, the evaluators were reassuring the consistency of the data through cross-validation techniques. The combination technique did produce more valid data for the evaluators' use. Thus, all the field data for this study were collected through the instruments listed below:

Questionnaires

1. Principals Questionnaire
2. Classroom and Resource Teacher's Questionnaire
3. Parent Advisory Council's Questionnaire
4. Non-teaching Professional's Questionnaire
5. Para-professional's Questionnaire
6. Title I Parent's Questionnaire

Interview

1. Principal's Interview
2. Classroom and Resource Teacher's Interview
3. Administrator's Interview
4. Interview for Special Education Staff

Observation

1. Observation check-list - Special Education Learning Centers
2. Observation check-list - Elementary, Secondary, and Non-public Schools

In addition to these basic instruments, the evaluation team has made extensive use of documentary data collected from previous evaluation reports, minutes of various Title I meetings, reports of Title I Coordinators, and the legislation pertaining to the Title I program. Detailed analysis of such secondary data has revealed the authenticity and consistency of the field data, thus making the study both valid and reliable.

Over and above these two sources of data, the evaluation team has used the standardized test data provided by PSDC for determining the cost-effectiveness of the Competitive Partnership programs. The test results were also used to cross-tabulate the responses received from the field data.

Data Interpretation and Analysis

There were three kinds of data, as the instrument section has indicated, for the evaluation team to assemble:

1. Field Data - This included all the information collected through questionnaires, interview schedules, and observations as was designed by the evaluators.
2. Documentary Data - Often referred to as "secondary data," were collected from previous reports, legislation and their amendments, and minutes of different meetings of Title I staff.
3. Test Data - These are the results of the standardized tests as provided by the Division of Research and Evalution Office of the D.C. Public Schools.

All three of these data were collected, organized and processed with extreme care and a high degree of confidentiality. Field data were collected in the months of May and June, 1974, under very tight schedule, due to the lateness in getting the evaluation project under way. However, all data were collected as planned and carefully organized for computer analysis as they arrived.

The instruments were mostly pre-coded and that helped to reduce the length of time normally needed to code the data once collected. Nevertheless, the volume of data to be analyzed was so huge that the time available to process them for reporting was still quite small. The delay in getting the test results further added to the complexity of getting the analysis completed on the target date. In spite of that, the results of preliminary analysis were reported through monthly reports, and two comprehensive Interim Reports submitted to the Division of Research and Evaluation Office of PSDC as previously agreed. It might have helped the school system to plan for next year's Title I program.

An extensive analysis of all the data was completed in October and the Findings section of this report deals with them exclusively. The data were analyzed at the Context, Input, Process, and Product levels as was projected earlier and results with appropriate recommendations are provided in that section.

The analysis in most cases was limited to frequency, percentage, mean, and standard deviation. However, correlation co-efficient, "F" and "T" tests were also administered wherever a significance of difference was in question. The results of the actual statistical analysis are given in the Findings Section. Interviews and questionnaires of small groups such as Non-public school principals and staff, were hand tabulated to assure greater accuracy. Similarly, secondary data were analyzed by hand, taking the most pertinent information from the available documents.

CHAPTER II

PUBLIC SCHOOL STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS

HIGHLIGHTS OF RESULTS

Standardized pretests and posttests administered by the PSDC are as follows:

Grade	Pretest	Posttest
1	Metropolitan Readiness Test, Form A	California Achievement Tests, Form B
2	California Achievement Tests, Form A	California Tests of Basic Skills, Form R
3 & 7	California Tests of Basic Skills, Form Q	California Tests of Basic Skills, Form R

Testing was carried out during the weeks of September 24, 1973 for the pretest and May 27, 1974 for the posttest.

Grade equivalent norms for large city schools for pretest and posttest are as follows:

Grade	Pretest	Posttest
1	-	1.8
2	2.0	2.8
3	3.0	3.8
7	7.0	7.8

Table II-1 shows the results of the analysis of the reading tests, and Table II-2 shows the results of the mathematics tests in grade equivalent scores for the Title I students. Both total scores and subtest scores are presented in these tables. Key points of the results for reading in Table II-1 are as follows:

1. Gains (total score grade equivalents) in reading by grade are more satisfactory, and also meet the objectives established by the Title I program, for grade 2 than for grades 3 and 7. Results are:

Grade	Gain Score grade equivalent in reading
2	1.0
3	0.8
7	0.7

2. Improvement in reading was slightly higher - about one month grade equivalent - in vocabulary as compared to comprehension. Results are:

	Gain Score grade equivalent in Vocabulary & Comprehension		
Grade	Vocabulary	Comprehension	Gain Difference
2	1.0	0.8	0.2
3	0.9	0.8	0.1
7	0.7	0.6	0.1

3. At the end of the school year, when the posttests were administered, the percentages (estimated from the means and standard deviations) of Title I students who reached or exceeded grade level in reading were as follows:

Grade	Percentage of Title I Students Reaching or Exceeding Grade Level
1	39
2	36
3	28
7	3

These percentages give some idea of the students who may no longer require Title I services in the following year.

Table II-2 shows the results for mathematics. Key points are as follows:

1. Gains (total score grade equivalents) are more satisfactory, and also meet the objectives established by the Title I program, for grade 3 than for grades 2 and 7. Results are:

Gain Score Grade Equivalent for Mathematics

Grade	Gain
2	.9
3	1.1
7	.8

2. At the end of the school year, when the posttests were administered, the percentages of students who reached or exceeded grade level in mathematics were as follows:

Grade	Percentage of Title I Students Reaching or Exceeding Grade Level
1	36
2	32
3	38
7	5

Initial deficits in reading and mathematics are shown in the pretest results. As one would expect, seventh grade Title I students showed the greatest deficits.

For grade 1, it is not possible to obtain gain scores because the tests used do not lend themselves to this purpose. However, several observations can be made with regard to the results for grade 1.

1. By the end of the first grade. Title I students are 3 months behind grade level in both reading and mathematics.
2. The problem areas at the beginning of the year for grade 1 students, as measured by the Metropolitan Readiness Test, are presented in Table II-3. These results are presented in terms of "letter ratings of readiness status." The ratings as presented in the MRT manual (page 11) are:

"Letter Rating	Readiness Status	Significance
"A	Superior	Apparently very well prepared for first-grade work. Should be given opportunity for enriched work in line with abilities indicated.
"B	High Normal	Good prospects for success in first-grade work provided other indications, such as health, emotional factors, etc., are consistent.
"C	Average	Likely to succeed in first-grade work. Careful study should be made of the specific strengths and weaknesses of pupils in this group and their instruction planned accordingly.
"D	Low Normal	Likely to have difficulty in first-grade work. Should be assigned to slow section and given more individualized help.
"E	Low	Chances of difficulty high under ordinary instructional conditions. Further readiness work, assignment to slow sections, or individualized work is essential."

The results show a D rating in the Total score, Word Meaning, Listening, and Numbers, and C ratings in Matching, Alphabet, and Copying. Based on these results, one would judge that reasonable progress was made by the first grade students as a result of the Title I program.

3. The test (Metropolitan Readiness Test - 50th percentile), used for grade 1 as the basis on which students are designated as Title I students, admits a much smaller percentage

of students to Title I than do tests used at other grades. The number and percentage of all students in each grade who were Title I identified based on the pretest data is as follows:

Grade	Number Title I	Number Not Title I	Percent Title I
1	3062	2620	54
2	4534	1027	82
3	4907	770	86
7	5432	99	98

These results suggest that a criterion score for grade 1 should be set at a much higher level, perhaps the 75th percentile, in order to include a larger percentage of students and prevent future learning deficits.

Table II - 1

PUBLIC SCHOOL READING TEST RESULTS FOR TITLE I STUDENTS BY GRADE* --- GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES**

		Total Score			Vocabulary			Comprehension		
Grade	Statistic	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
1***	Mean	***	1.5	***	***	1.5	***	***	1.8	***
	S.D.	***	.80	***	***	.81	***	***	.86	***
	N	***	1433	***	***	1577	***	***	1436	***
2	Mean	1.4	2.4	1.0	1.5	2.5	1.0	1.5	2.3	.8
	S.D.	.61	.93	.73	.62	.99	.77	.66	1.07	1.13
	N	2747	2738	2612	2813	2777	2710	2757	2747	2630
3	Mean	2.3	3.1	.8	2.1	3.0	.9	2.3	3.1	.8
	S.D.	.77	1.03	.94	.87	1.19	1.14	.84	1.17	1.11
	N	3020	3004	2888	3043	3025	2927	3029	3016	2909
7	Mean	4.7	5.4	.7	4.8	5.5	.7	4.6	5.2	.6
	S.D.	1.53	1.71	1.18	1.76	1.89	1.60	1.47	1.75	1.34
	N	2287	2127	2004	2315	2168	2066	2313	2141	2037

---

* Matched records only.

** Grade equivalents for the pretest are the grade plus .0 and for the posttest the grade plus 0.8.

*** Gain score not obtained due to different tests used in pretest and posttest: Pretest - Metropolitan Readiness Test; Posttest - CAT.

Table II - 2

PUBLIC SCHOOL MATHEMATICS TEST RESULTS FOR TITLE I STUDENTS BY GRADE* --- GRADE EQUIVALENT SCORES**

		Total Score			Computation			Concepts		
Grade	Statistic	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest	Gain	Pretest	Posttest	Gain
1***	Mean	***	1.5	***	***	1.4	***	***	1.7	***
	S.D.	***	.71	***	***	.71	***	***	.89	***
	N	***	1490	***	***	1490	***	***	1557	***
2	Mean	1.5	2.4	.9	1.5	2.3	.8	1.7	2.8	1.1
	S.D.	.57	.76	.61	.61	.78	.70	.69	1.08	.91
	N	2772	2765	2685	2774	2765	2660	2792	2786	2694
3	Mean	2.4	3.5	1.1	2.5	3.6	1.1	2.3	3.2	.9
	S.D.	.65	.82	.80	.68	.86	.91	.93	1.19	1.20
	N	2854	2865	2619	3065	3048	2974	2969	2961	2800
7	Mean	4.7	5.5	.8	4.9	5.7	.8	4.8	5.6	.8
	S.D.	1.30	1.50	1.08	1.35	1.62	1.32	1.59	1.84	1.60
	N	2093	1790	1601	2299	2001	1897	2189	1872	1735

---

* Matched records only.
** Grade equivalents for the pretest are the grade plus .0 and for the posttest the grade plus 0.8.
*** Gain score not obtained.

Table II - 3

METROPOLITAN READINESS TEST RESULTS
FIRST GRADE PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS TESTED IN SEPTEMBER 1973

	Mean Raw Score	Letter Rating
TOTAL SCORE	39.5	D
Word Meaning	5.6	D
Listening	7.4	D
Matching	6.4	C
Alphabet	9.1	C
Numbers	8.3	D
Copying	5.2	C

TECHNICAL NOTE

Title I students were identified on the test records as those students scoring at or below the 50th percentile on the pretest; or, in those cases where only grade equivalent scores were available, as those students scoring at or below grade level. The test record had no other indication as to who was a Title I student. In order to calculate gain scores for the students, it was also necessary to match pretest and posttest records for the students, using the student' identification number. The results of the matching process and of Title I vs. non-Title I students for reading and mathematics are shown in Tables II-4 and II-5, in terms of the number and percentage of students in each category. Examination of the tables indicates that about half of the grade 1 students, and about 60% of grade 2 and 3 students had matching student identification numbers, while only about 40% of the 7th grade students had matching records for the pretest and the posttest. The tables also show that the percentage of Title I students identified by the pretests exceeded 80% for grades 2, 3 and 7.

Although the resulting samples of Title I students were quite large relative to the total population of students, and should adequately represent the population test results, a comparison of pretest results of Title I students of the matched and unmatched group was undertaken. Table II-6 shows the results of this analysis. This table shows that for reading in grades 3 and 7, students for whom it was not possible to match records had lower average grade equivalent scores compared to those for whom matched records were available. In mathematics, there was a difference only for grade 7 students. The differences range from one to three months in grade equivalents.

These differences may be attributable to several factors: 1. Less capable students may be absent from school more frequently during testing periods than the more able students.

2. Less capable students may tend to transfer schools more often or, in the case of 7th graders, to drop out of school by the time of the posttest.

3. Less than adequate use by school personnel of student identification numbers, resulting in unmatched records, when in fact the students actually took both the pretest and the posttest.

Table II - 4

PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS - READING TESTS

PERCENTAGE OF TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I STUDENTS
PERCENT MATCHED AND UNMATCHED RECORDS AND
PERCENT LOSS OF STUDENTS FROM PRETEST TO POSTTEST BY GRADE

	Percent of Title I and Non-Title I Students						Percent of Total	Matched Records	Percent Loss of Students from Pretest to Posttest				
	Matched		Unmatched		Total								
Grade	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Matched	Unmatched		Total	
1 TI	52.8	52.0	55.4	-	54.0	-	51.5	-	9.6	-			
Non-TI	47.2	48.0	44.6	-	46.0	-	54.1	-	6.5				
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	52.7	55.5	8.1	484	18.0	728	12.8
2 TI	81.1	81.4	82.3	-	81.5	-	60.6	-	.3				
Non-TI	18.9	18.6	17.7	-	18.5	-	62.5	-	2.6				
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	60.9	60.5	.8	195	9.0	221	4.0
3 TI	85.8	86.1	87.4	-	86.4	-	61.5	-	.5				
Non-TI	14.2	13.9	12.6	-	13.6	-	64.8	-	2.6				
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	62.0	61.5	.8	133	6.2	162	2.9
7 TI	97.4	97.6	98.8	-	98.2	-	42.1	-	7.0				
Non-TI	2.6	2.4	1.2	-	1.8	-	61.6	-	13.1				
Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	42.5	59.2	7.2	1683	52.9	1851	33.5
All TI Grades	78.6	78.9	81.4	-	79.9	-	53.4	-	3.5				
Non-TI	21.4	21.1	18.6	-	20.1	-	58.0	-	5.0				
Total------	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	54.6	60.5	3.8	2495	24.4	2962	13.2

Table II - 5

PUBLIC SCHOOL STUDENTS - MATHEMATICS TESTS

PERCENTAGE OF TITLE I AND NON-TITLE I STUDENTS
PERCENT MATCHED AND UNMATCHED RECORDS AND
PERCENT LOSS OF STUDENTS FROM PRETEST TO POSTTEST BY GRADE

		Percent of Title I and Non-Title I Students						Percent of Total	Matched Records	Percent Loss of Students from Pretest to Posttest					
		Matched		Unmatched		Total				Matched		Unmatched		Total	
Grade		Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post	Pre	Post						
1	TI	52.8	52.2	55.4	-	54.0	-	51.5	-	95	6.0				
	Non-TI	47.2	47.8	44.6	-	46.0	-	54.1	-	55	3.9				
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	52.7	55.4	150	5.0	401	14.9	551	9.7
2	TI	81.2	81.5	82.5	-	81.7	-	60.4	-	7	.3				
	Non-TI	18.8	18.5	17.5	-	18.3	-	62.5	-	13	2.0				
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	60.8	62.7	20	.6	186	8.5	206	3.7
3	TI	85.1	85.5	86.3	-	85.6	-	62.6	-	(11)					
	Non-TI	14.9	14.5	13.7	-	14.4	-	64.8	-	13	2.6				
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	62.9	63.6	2	.1	61	3.1	63	1.2
7	TI	97.2	97.0	98.6	-	97.9	-	44.7	-	303	14.5				
	Non-TI	2.8	3.0	1.4	-	2.1	-	61.6	-	6	9.8				
	Total	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	45.0	60.1	309	14.3	1405	53.4	1714	35.8
All Grades	TI	78.0	77.9	80.0	-	78.9	-	55.0	-	394	4.2				
	Non-TI	22.0	22.1	20.0	-	21.1	-	58.0	-	87	3.3				
	Total------	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	55.6	60.6	481	4.0	2053	21.6	2534	11.8

Table II - 6

PUBLIC SCHOOL TEST RESULTS

COMPARISON OF MATCHED AND UNMATCHED PRETEST RESULTS OF TITLE I STUDENTS

		READING TESTS				MATHEMATICS TESTS			
		Total Grade Equivalent Score				Total Grade Equivalent Score			
Grade	Statistic	Matched	Unmatched	Z*	Significance	Matched	Unmatched	Z*	Significance
2	Mean	1.4	1.4	0.0	No	1.5	1.5	0.0	No
	S.D.	.61	.62			.57	.59		
	N	2747	1787			2772	1816		
3	Mean	2.3	2.2	4.43	Yes	2.4	2.4	0.0	No
	S.D.	.77	.77		.001	.65	.69		
	N	3020	1887			2854	1745		
7	Mean	4.7	4.4	7.13	Yes	4.7	4.5	4.20	Yes
	S.D.	1.53	1.52		.001	1.30	1.28		.001
	N	2287	3145			2093	2593		

		METROPOLITAN READINESS TEST - TOTAL RAW SCORE			
		Matched	Unmatched	Z*	Significance
1	Mean	40.2	38.7	3.67	Yes
	S.D.	11.00	11.71		.001
	N	1585	1492		

$$* \; Z = \frac{M_1 - M_2}{\sqrt{\frac{N_1 + N_2}{N_1 N_2}}}$$

USEFULNESS OF THE STANDARDIZED TESTS FOR THE TITLE I PROGRAM AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TESTING AND EVALUATION

The standardized tests used for the Title I program, in addition to those listed earlier in this section, also include the Caldwell Pre-School Inventory for kindergarten students and the Wide Range Achievement Test for Special Education. This discussion is, however, confined to the Metropolitan Readiness Test, the California Achievement Tests, and the California Tests of Basic Skills, as data was analyzed and examined only for these tests.

As standardized tests, these instruments meet or exceed the basic requirements of reliability and validity that would be expected of any standardized test. In addition, the California Test Bureau, publishers of the California Achievement Tests and the California Tests of Basic Skills, provide norms for large city school systems as well as national norms. The large city norms, used in the analyses in this report, are suitable for the Title I population and for the minority populations characteristic of urban American populations. Comparisons made with the large city norms take account of population differences, which are in part a function of minority and socio-economic status.

The tests themselves (CAT and CTBS) have been selected to focus upon the major goals of the Title I program - e.g., reading and mathematics. While additional measures might be desirable, the demands upon the students which additional testing would require, and the incursion of testing time upon teaching time, would not appear to warrant expanding the scope of the tests. Especially with pretests and posttests given in grades 1-3 and 7 for Title I, additional testing does not appear to be justified.

The pretests are used in the Title I program as the basis for identifying Title I designated students. Those students in target schools who score at the 50th percentile or below are the designated Title I students. As indicated earlier in this chapter, this method seems to identify a large percentage of students in grades 2 and 3 in Title I schools as eligible for Title I services, but a comparatively small percentage of grade 1 students (MRT). For this reason it is recommended that the score on the MRT used to identify Title I students for grade 1 be adjusted upward to include a larger percentage of students in the Title I eligible schools. The lack of comparability in the MRT pretest and the CAT posttest for grade 1 has probably presented some technical difficulties. However, inclusion of a larger percentage of grade 1 students seems warranted on the basis of attempting to prevent learning deficiencies.

The results of the pretests are also provided to the schools and teachers to show which students are Title I designated, and also as a diagnostic aid in teaching. However, a variety of other tests are used by the teachers for diagnostic teaching purposes. Tables II - 7 and II - 8 show the tests used by the teachers. Teacher-made tests top the list, followed by the MRT, CAT and CTBS. Also frequently mentioned were CP diagnostic tests. The need for timely feedback of test results and for more detailed diagnostic information was mentioned by a number of the teachers interviewed as among the reasons for using other tests. More rapid feedback of test results to schools and teachers is needed.

Although useful, the standardized tests should only be considered a partial measure of the effectiveness of the Title I program. A measure of school readiness at the end of kindergarten, perhaps the Metropolitan Readiness Test now used at the beginning of grade 1, would be suitable.

The tests used yield only a limited number of scores - vocabulary, comprehension, and total score for reading and computation, concepts and total score for mathematics. While important and useful, this information should be supplemented by other measures of student progress and achievement. School grades, grade retention, and a student progress checklist would be useful. Affective measures are also needed and would not require additional testing time. Deviations of school grades and of test results might be informative in assessing the extent to which classroom and test performance are effected differently by the various Title I program components. Progress checklists would be useful in measuring specific learning needs that may be impacted differently by the various Title I programs. For comparability among the Title I programs, a single instrument should be devised.

Table II - 7

THE TESTS UTILIZED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL TITLE I CLASSROOM TEACHERS DURING FY 1974

Frequency	Percentage	Tests
33	62.3	Informal Teacher-made tests
26	49.0	Publishers tests (D.C. Heath, McGraw-Hill, Random House & Addison-Wesley)
24	45.2	California Achievement Test
23	43.4	Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test
25	47.2	D.C. Criterion Reference Test (Math)
26	49.1	D.C. Criterion Reference Test (Reading)
12	22.6	California Test of Basic Skills
7	13.2	Caldwell Pre-School Inventory
4	7.5	Informal Reading Inventory
3	5.7	Phonetics Test
2	3.8	Gates Reading Test

Table II - 8

THE FREQUENCY AND PERCENTAGE OF THE TESTS UTILIZED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL MATHEMATICS RESOURCE TEACHERS

Frequency	Percentage	Tests
25	61.0	Informal Teacher-made tests
23	56.1	California Achievement Test
21	51.2	Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test
19	46.3	California Test of Basic Skills
19	46.3	Publishers test (mainly Random House)
17	41.5	D.C. Criterion Reference Test (Math)
15	36.6	Caldwell Pre-School Inventory
5	12.2	D.C. Criterion Reference Test (Math)

CHAPTER III

PROGRAMS IN THE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

INTRODUCTION

This chapter starts by summarizing the reactions of Public Elementary School Personnel to the Title I Program followed by detailed results of teaching practices in the elementary schools relevant to the Total Learning Center concept. Related information for the public elementary schools is also presented in the chapters on Staff Development, Parental Involvement Program. Public School Test Results and Cost Effectiveness of the Competitive Partnership programs.

The instruments used in the analysis for the Public Elementary schools were as follows: Principals' Questionnaire, Principals' Interview, Teachers Questionnaire, Teachers Interview, Non-Teaching Professionals Questionnaire, Para-professionals Questionnaire.

OUTSTANDING FEATURES, PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The following summarizes the findings of the outstanding features, problems and recommendations concerning the Title I program in elementary schools. The information was collected from interviews with reading resource teachers, mathematics resource teachers, classroom teachers, and principals, and from Teacher Questionnaires and Principals Questionnaires. The data is summarized in Tables III-1 to III-4 and organized according to responses received through the various survey instruments. Detailed statistical data is given in Tables III-5 to III-13.

Outstanding Features

The availability and variety of materials and supplies was clearly the most outstanding feature of the Title I program, and the workshops related to the materials were also considered helpful by all participants. (Table III-1)

The staff was the second outstanding area receiving comment. The services of the resource teachers were considered outstanding by classroom teachers and principals; and the assistance of the educational aides was considered a contributing factor to program success by all categories of respondents. The reading resource teachers and principals cited the pupil personnel services as an outstanding feature, as well as parental involvement.

The classroom teachers and principals stressed the value and importance of such supportive services as the clothing and medical programs and of cultural enrichment activities. The resource teachers and principals cited the increased ability to provide individualized instruction as an outstanding feature of the program.

Problems and Recommendations

There is a close correlation between the problems identified by the respondents and the recommendations for program improvement. Recommendations outside of these correlations were made by only single groups of respondents with one major exception. The resource teachers and the principals both recommended that only one Competitive Partnership program be used at a school and the resource teachers further recommended that they be allowed to select that program.

There was a widespread expression of concern with respect to the late arrival of materials and supplies, and indeed, the effects of this

TABLE III-1

OUTSTANDING FEATURES OF THE TITLE I PROGRAM REPORTED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL

	Classroom Teacher	Reading Res. Tchr.	Math Res. Teacher	Principal
Supplies and Equipment	X	X	X	X
Workshops	X	X	X	X
Assistance of educational aides	X	X	X	X
Services of resource teachers	X			X
Supportive services (clothing program, medical program, etc.)	X			X
Cultural enrichment program	X			X
Parental Involvement			X	X
Ability for individualized instruction		X	X	X
Staff support from pupil personnel workers			X	X

problem are visible in the academic results of the students. In response to the need for timely delivery, the principals recommended the provision of a delivery system. In many instances the materials were inadequate or never arrived and the classroom teachers noted a lack of manipulative materials or devices. The mathematics resource teachers recommended that more D. C. Heath manipulatives be provided and commented that the Addison Wesley program was most useful with regard to such devices.

Staffing was another area of concern and was inadequate in several aspects. The most widespread need was for additional educational aides and it was recommended that the aides be specified for either reading or math. Both classroom and resource teachers recommended hiring more resource teachers and the resource teachers indicated a need for consultants. The principals indicated a need for full-time rather than part-time program assistants to aid in administering the program and a number of principals noted inadequate services of health aides, psychologists and other support staff.

There was a general consensus that too much paperwork and recordkeeping was required and it was thought that implementing a uniform system of recordkeeping might reduce this burden to some extent.

There was also a general expression of concern over the lack of communication between the staff, school and central office. The teachers, in particular, thought the guidelines were unclear and improvement in that regard as well as in overall Title I program coordination was recommended.

General lack of funds was apparently not a widespread problem, although it may have been in some schools; in particular, however, there is a lack of funds for cultural enrichment which classroom teachers would like to see remedied. Resource teachers also experienced a delay in releasing funds and the principals' suggestion to have local school planning and budget control might eliminate that problem.

There appears to be a distinct need for improvement in the staff development area. Over 85 percent of the resource and classroom teachers had no understanding of the total team approach and the principals, in many instances, had little knowledge of staff development activities in general. Presumably increased familiarity with the total team approach would enhance communication between Title I staff which was discussed above as an area of concern. One means of facilitating this familiarity is through pre-planning workshops, which was recommended by several resource teachers. In addition, classroom teachers observed that the workshops are poorly scheduled and, in some instances, poorly planned and usntable. In the improvement of workshop scheduling attention should be given to the need for providing classroom coverage or for providing staff development sessions after instructional hours.

Finally, there was some concern on the part of the resource teachers and principals over lack of parent involvement, although this was not found among all the schools. The resource teachers suggested that parents be familiarized with the program so that they might reinforce their children's experiences at home.

TABLE III-2

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED WITH THE TITLE I PROGRAM REPORTED BY PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL

	Res. Tchr. Questionn.	Principal Questionn.	Resource Tchr. Int.	Classroom Tchr Int.	Principal Interview
Late Arrival of Materials and Supplies	X	X	X	X	X
Inadequate materials or materials never received	+		+	+	+
Not enough manipulative materials or devices				+	
Inadequate Staffing	X	X	X	X	X
Lack of educational aides	+	+	+	+	+
Inadequate services of health aides, psychologist, and other staff		+			+
Part-time program assistant		+			+
Too Much Recordkeeping or Paperwork	X	X	X	X	X
Too much administrative bureaucracy in overall Title I Administration		+			
Lack of Communication	X		X	X	X
Between secondary staff & reading tchr			+	+	
Between school and central office			+		+
Guidelines unclear	+		+	+	
Problem of identifying Title I students (late arrival of list)	+				
Funds		X	X	X	X
Lack of funds			+		+
Lack of funds for cultural enrichment				+	
Delay in releasing funds			+		
Workshops	X	X	X	X	X
Lack of classroom coverage		+			
No understanding of total team approach	+		+	+	
Unstable and poorly scheduled or planned		+		+	+
Frequency of workshops					+
Lack of parental involvement		X	X		X

X -- general area of concern by group of respondents
+ -- specific item of concern within the general area

TABLE III-3

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE TITLE I PROGRAM MADE BY PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL

	Resource Teachers	Mathematics Res. Teacher	Reading Res. Teacher	Classroom Teacher	Principal
Improve paperwork and recordkeeping situation	X	X	X	X	
Reduce amount of paperwork	+		+		
Provide uniform system of recordkeeping		+	+		
Have materials and supplies arrive on time	X	X	X	X	X
Provide delivery system					+
Provide more materials		+			
Improvement of communication and program Coordination	X	X	X	X	X
Better system of communication between staff, school and central office			+	+	
More well defined guidelines	+	+	+		
Better coordination of Title I program				+	+
Have program coordinator					+
More planning between teachers and Title I office		+			
Limit CP programs to one per school	+		+		+
Let teachers choose own CP program	+		+		
Improve or expand workshops	X	X	X	X	X
Have pre-planning workshops	+				
Have additional workshops		+	+		
Improve scheduling of workshops				+	+
Have staff development after instructional hours					+
Hire more staff	X	X		X	X
Hire more educational aides		+		+	+
Designate area of speciality for aides (math or reading)		+			
Hire more resource teachers		+		+	
Provide for consultants	+				
Provide full-time program assistant					+

Table III-3 (continued)

	Resource Teachers	Mathematics Res. Teacher	Reading Res. Teacher	Classroom Teacher	Principals
Increase parental involvement				+	
Provide more information to parents so they can assist at home	+				
Provide better training for parents				+	
Provide more funds for special services			+		
Provide more cultural enrichment				+	
More teacher input in program				+	
Have local school planning and budget control					+
Provide job security for Title I staff					+
Improve criteria for selection of Title I schools				+	
More and equal distribution of equipment		+			
Provide more D.C. Heath manipulatives	+				
Provide more information on metric system	+				
Use Addison Wesley for manipulative and Random House for testing	+				

X -- general area of concern by group of respondents
+ -- specific item of concern within the general area

TABLE III-4

CORRELATION OF PROBLEMS AND RECOMMENDATIONS REPORTED BY PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PERSONNEL

		Resource Teachers	Classroom Teachers	Principals
P	Late arrival of materials and supplies	+	+	+
R	have materials and supplies arrive on time	+	+	+
R	provide delivery system			+
P	Inadequate materials or materials never received	+	+	+
R	Provide more materials	mrt		
P	Not enough manipulative materials or devices		+	
R	Provide more materials	mrt		
R	Provide more D.C. Heath manipulatives	mrt		
R	Use Addison Wesley for manipulatives and Random House for testing	mrt		
P	Inadequate staffing	X	X	X
R	Hire more resource teachers	mrt	+	
R	Provide for consultants	+		
P	Lack of educational aides	+	+	+
R	Hire more educational aides	mrt	+	+
R	designate area of specialty for aides	mrt		
P	Inadequate services of health aides, psychologist, and other support staff			+
R	Provide more funds for special services	rrt		
P	Part-time program assistant			+
R	Provide full time program assistant			+

Table III-4 (continued)

		Resource Teachers	Classroom Teachers	Principals
P	Too much recordkeeping or paperwork	+	+	+
R	Reduce amount of paperwork	+	+	
R	Provide uniform system of recordkeeping	+		
P	Too much administrative bureaucracy in overall Title-I Administration			+
R	Have local school planning and budget control			+
P	Lack of communication	+	+	+
P	Between secondary staff and reading teacher	+	+	
R	Have better system of communication between staff, school and central office	+	+	
R	Have program coordinator			+
R	More planning between teachers and Title-I staff	mrt		
P	Between school and central office	+		+
R	Have better system of communication between staff, school and central office	+	+	
P	Guidelines unclear	+	+	
R	More well defined guidelines	+		
P	Problem of identifying Title-I students (late arrival of list)	+		
R	Better coordination of Title-I program		+	+
P	Funds			
P	Lack of funds	+		+
P	Lack of funds for cultural enrichment		+	
R	Provide more cultural enrichment		+	
P	Delay in releasing funds	+		
R	Have local school planning and budget control			+

Table III-4 (continued)

		Resource Teachers	Classroom Teachers	Principals
P	Workshops			
P	Lack of classroom coverage			+
R	Have staff development after instructional hours			+
R	Improve scheduling of workshops		+	+
P	No understanding of total team approach	+	+	
R	Have pre-planning workshops	+		
P	Unstable and poorly scheduled or planned		+	+
R	Improve scheduling of workshops		+	+
P	Frequency of			+
R	Have additional workshops	+		
P	Lack of parental involvement	+		+
R	Increase parental involvement		+	
R	Provide more information to parents so they can assist at home	+		
R	Provide better training for parents		+	

P -- Problem
R -- Recommendation

TABLE III-5

MAJOR STRENGTHS OF THE FY 1974 TITLE I PROGRAM
AS REPORTED BY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AND SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS*

Major Strengths	Percent	Frequency
Supplies and equipment	36.5%	27
Services provided by reading and mathematics resource teachers	31.1%	23
Assistance of the teachers' aides	25.7%	19
Supportive services, including Clothing Program, Medical Program, etc.	24.3%	18
Parental involvement	23.0%	17
Cultural Enrichment Program	20.3%	15
Students' progress in reading and mathematics	14.9%	11
Pupil personnel services	12.2%	9
Competitive Partnership Program and its materials	12.2%	9
Service of program assistants	9.5%	7
CPP consultant services	9.5%	7
Objectives of the Title I program	8.1%	6
Better communications and cooperation	8.1%	6
Individualized instructions	8.1%	6
Improved workshops for parents, teachers, aides	6.8%	5
Reading Program	6.8%	5
Other Responses	64.9%	48

* Principals Interview

TABLE III-6

PROBLEMS OF THE FY 1974 TITLE I PROGRAM AS REPORTED BY ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS*

	Percent	Frequency
Late arrival and/or unavailability of materials and supplies	60.8%	45
The frequency and the scheduling of workshops	24.3%	18
Not enough teacher aides	24.3%	18
Inadequate services of health aides, psychologist and/or other supportive staff	17.6%	13
Program Assistant works part-time	14.9%	11
Lack of delivery and transportation services	12.2%	9
Lacking in parental involvement & cooperation	10.8%	8
Too much paperwork	9.5%	7
No math resource teacher	9.5%	7
Lack of communication between Title I office and schools	9.5%	7
Inadequate funding	8.1%	6
The reading program	6.8%	5
Lack of experienced and cooperative personnel	6.8%	5
Other responses	109.5%	81

* Principals Interview

TABLE III-7

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE FY 1975 TITLE I PROGRAM AS SUGGESTED BY ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS*

	Percent	Frequency
Have a full-time Program Assistant in each school	12.2%	9
There needs to be a highly qualified Program Coordinator in each school building	6.8%	5
No changes necessary	6.8%	5
Provide some system of delivery for materials and Supplies	6.8%	5
Have local school planning and control of budget	6.8%	5
Broaden the scope of the program	6.8%	5
Have materials and personnel at the school on time or before the school opens	5.4%	4
Better coordination and cooperation of the program	5.4%	4
Select only one Reading and only one Mathematics program	2.7%	2
Staff Development activities after instructional hours	2.7%	2
Provide more educational aides	2.7%	2
Title I people should have job security after two years of employment	2.7%	2

* Principals Interview

TABLE III-8
RATINGS GIVEN BY PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL PRINCIPALS TO VARIOUS PROGRAM AREAS*

	5 Excellent f**	 %	4 Good f	 %	3 Average r	 %	2 Below Av. f	 %	1 Poor f	 %	Total
STAFF PERFORMANCE											
Classroom Teachers	10	21.3	30	63.8	7	14.9	--	--	--	--	47
Reading Resource Teachers	17	34.7	24	49.0	5	10.2	2	4.1	1	2.0	49
Mathematics Resource Teachers	15	35.7	19	45.2	6	14.3	1	2.4	1	2.4	42
Teacher Aides	15	30.0	22	44.0	12	24.0	1	2.0	--	--	50
Clerical Staff	12	28.6	18	42.9	26	19.0	1	2.4	--	--	42
Custodial Staff	12	29.3	16	39.0	12	29.3	1	2.4	--	--	41
EFFECTIVENESS OF TITLE I PROGRAMS											
Competitive Partnership Programs	1	2.8	20	55.6	15	41.7	--	--	--	--	36
Math Remediation Program	7	16.7	23	54.8	7	16.7	3	7.1	2	4.8	42
Cultural Enrichment Programs	1	2.1	19	39.6	25	52.1	2	4.2	1	2.1	48
Clothing Program											
Speech Correction Program	1	4.8	7	33.3	9	42.9	3	14.3	1	4.8	21
Title I Corrective Program	--	--	9	39.1	11	47.8	2	8.7	1	4.4	23
Staff Development Program	3	7.0	22	51.2	17	39.5	1	2.3	--	--	43
Mediax Program in Developing Children's Perceptual Skills	1	11.1	1	11.1	7	77.8	--	--	--	--	9
PARENT PERFORMANCE AND COOPERATION											
Parent Advisory Council	1	4.1	13	26.5	19	38.8	12	24.5	3	6.1	49
Parent Volunteer Workers	4	8.0	22	44.0	22	44.0	2	4.0	--	--	50
COOPERATION OF TITLE I OFFICE AND CENTRAL OFFICE											
Title I Coordinators	13	27.1	22	45.8	13	27.1	--	--	--	--	48
LEA and/or SEA Title I Office of D.C. Public Schools	8	18.2	20	45.5	15	34.1	1	2.3	--	--	44
Office of the Superintendent of Instruction, D.C.P.S.	5	12.2	19	46.3	17	41.5	--	--	--	--	41
AVAILABILITY OF SUPPLIES, MATERIALS AND EQUIPMENT											
Necessary supplies and materials for the Title I Instructional Program	3	6.1	11	22.5	20	40.8	10	20.4	5	10.2	49
Necessary Audio-Visual Equipment	9	18.4	19	38.8	12	24.5	8	16.3	1	2.0	49

Table III-8 (continued)

	5 Excellent f	 %	4 Good f	 %	3 Average f	 %	2 Below Av. f	 %	1 Poor f	 %	Total
EFFECTIVENESS OF TITLE I TESTS											
Reliability of the Tests (Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test, California Achievement Test and CTBS) Administered for the Title I program by the D.C.P.S. in view of the overall performance of the students	1	2.3	12	27.9	23	53.5	6	14.0	1	2.3	43
Validity of the tests results in view of the overall performance of the students	1	2.5	12	30.0	23	57.5	3	7.5	1	2.5	40
GENERAL FEATURES											
Utilization of Title I Funds	9	19.6	20	43.5	12	26.1	4	8.7	1	2.2	46
Pupil Personnel Services	8	16.0	21	42.0	13	26.0	8	16.0	--	--	50
Special Education Learning Center	1	9.1	5	45.5	4	36.4	1	9.1	--	--	11
Coordination Efforts between Classroom Teachers and the mathematics/reading resource teachers	10	20.8	27	56.3	10	20.8	1	2.1	--	--	48
Classroom facilities as they effect the implementation and operation of a Title I program	7	14.6	21	43.8	20	41.7	--	--	--	--	48

* Principals Questionnaire

TABLE III-9

DIFFICULT EXPERIENCES REPORTED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS WITH THE TITLE I PROGRAM*

	Percent	Frequency
Late arrival and shortage of materials and supplies	76%	38
Need for full time program assistant	10%	5
Too much paper work	14%	7
Excessive number of meetings	14%	7
Insufficient educational hardware	2%	1
Inadequate instruction time in parochial school	0%	0
Classroom coverage during staff development sessions	24%	12
TOTAL		70

* Principals Questionnaire

TABLE III-10

ADMINISTRATIVE PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS* WITH THE TITLE I PROGRAM

	Frequency	Percent
Delay in releasing funds	31	62.0%
Too much paperwork	31	62.0%
Inadequate staffing	26	52.0%
Too much added administrative work due to Title I program	24	48.0%
Lack of parental involvement	19	38.0%
Too many part-time professional staff	17	34.0%
Too much administrative bureaucracy in the overall Title I Administration	12	24.0%
Inadequate facilities	10	20.0%
Poorly planned staff development programs	9	18.0%
Inadequate library	7	14.0%
Mathematics program	6	12.0%
Low staff morale	3	6.0%
Discipline in the school	2	4.0%
Low salary to attract quality people as teachers	2	4.0%
Reading program	2	4.0%
Overcrowded classrooms	1	2.0%

* Principals Questionnaire

TABLE III-11

MOST SIGNIFICANT AND POSITIVE EXPERIENCES ENCOUNTERED IN TITLE I BY PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS*

	1st Response		2nd Response		3rd Response		4th Response		5th Response		6th Response		Total	
	f**	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Cultural Enrichment	5	10.64%	5	14.29%	4	18.18%	1	14.29%	0	--	0	--	15	
Support Services	13	27.66%	7	20.00%	5	22.73%	2	28.57%	2	66.67%	0	--	29	
Reading Resource Teachers and Instructions	21	44.68%	9	25.71%	7	31.82%	3	42.86%	1	33.33%	0	--	41	
Parent Group Activities	3	6.38%	2	5.71%	1	4.55%	0	--	0	--	0	--	6	
Staff Development	4	8.51%	8	22.86%	3	13.64%	1	14.29%	0	--	1	100.00%	17	
Parent Partnership	1	2.13%	4	11.43%	2	9.09%	0	--	0	--	0	--	7	
TOTAL	47	100.00%	35	100.00%	22	100.00%	7	100.00%	3	100.00%	1	100.00%		

* Principals Interview

** Frequency

TABLE III-12

ADVANTAGES OF TITLE I PROGRAM AS REPORTED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

	Frequency	Percent
ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION	181	24.2%
Availability of materials for teachers and children	129	19.4%
Organization of the staff development program	45	6.8%
Having a choice of teaching materials	28	4.2%
Availability of teaching equipment	25	3.8%
Availability of multi-level teaching materials	24	3.6%
Advantages of larger budget	18	2.7%
Cooperation of Title I Staff	13	2.0%
Cluster meetings for resource teachers	6	.9%
Easy access to the distribution center	4	.6%
AFFECTIVE DOMAIN	81	12.2%
Enjoyable materials meeting the needs and interest levels of the students	61	9.2%
Cultural enrichment opportunities	49	7.4%
Motivation of children	17	2.6%
Motivation of teachers	12	1.8%
Receiving of physical comforts through pupil personnel	11	1.7%
Pleasure of working with Title I students and pleasure from working with other Title I teachers	2	.3%
COGNITIVE DOMAIN	60	9.0%
Increased rate of individual pupil progress	20	3.0%
Emphasis on the reinforcement teaching	16	2.4%
Small group instruction	13	2.0%
Diagnostic-prescriptive teaching	8	1.2%
Advantages of Math Center	7	1.1%
Advantages of having a Center for reading materials	6	.9%
Individualized instruction	1	.2%
SUPPORT SERVICES	74	11.1%
Assistance of the resource teachers	74	11.1%
Assistance of the consultants	20	3.0%
Assistance of the parent volunteers	13	2.0%
Assistance of the pupil personnel workers	11	1.7%
Cooperation of the classroom teachers	6	.9%
Assistance of the aides	1	.2%

TABLE III-13

DISADVANTAGES OF TITLE I PROGRAM AS REPORTED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL TEACHERS

	Frequency	Percent
ORGANIZATION AND ADMINISTRATION	198	29.7%
Materials ordered not received on time and materials ordered not received at all	286	43.6%
Too much paperwork and too much needless paperwork	66	10.1%
Inadequate and confusing program guidelines	46	6.9%
Inadequate communication between Title I office and school personnel	30	4.5%
Scheduling problems with resource teachers	25	3.3%
Inadequate documentation and record keeping	24	3.6%
Lack of time to do paper work	17	2.6%
Scheduling problems for resource teachers	15	2.3%
Lack of special staff development programs for teachers new to Title I office & school personnel	13	2.0%
Not having staff development program prior to opening of school	12	1.8%
Temporary job status of all Title I personnel	9	1.4%
Being kept out of Competitive Partnership program	9	1.4%
Too many workshops	5	.8%
Lack of classroom space for resource teachers	1	.2%
Lack of relevant materials for elementary students	11	1.7%
Moving a school into Title I and then out of Title I	3	.4%
Lack of funds for cultural enrichment; lack of relevant materials for secondary students; expected to reach too many children	3	.4%
COGNITIVE DOMAIN	55	8.3%
Conflict between CP and Basal Reading and Math Programs	14	2.1%
Not enough additional workshops for teachers	9	1.4%
Not having any materials other than Title I materials	8	1.2%
Not being able to participate in CP of choice	3	.4%
Failure of classroom teachers to use the CP materials in mathematics	2	.3%
Teachers not being adequately trained to use materials	2	.3%
Aides covering the classrooms	2	.3%
Failure of classroom teachers to use the CP materials in reading	2	.3%
SUPPORT SERVICES	56	8.4%
Inconsistency of services of reading resource teachers	2	.3%
Inconsistency of services of math resource teachers	2	.3%
Not having the full time service of an aide; not having the service of an aide	3	.5%
Aides not adequately trained	2	.3%
No service from reading resource teachers; no service from math resource teacher; lack of parental involvement	3	.4%

TABLE III-14

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON TEACHERS

POSITION	Percent
Classroom Teachers	88%
Reading Resource Teachers	7%
Mathematics Resource Teachers	5%
TOTAL	100%
N	650
SEX	
Males	2%
Females	98%
TOTAL	100%
N	650
AGE	
20-29	31%
30-39	34%
40-49	23%
50 and up	12%
TOTAL	100%
N	650

TOTAL LEARNING CENTERS

The Total Learning Center concept is the P.S.D.C.'s approach to the individualization of instruction. Consistent with this approach, the Title I program has targetted its resources in such a way as to better enable staff members to give attention to the individual needs of the child. These resources include the following important elements:

Staff: Reading Resrouce Teacher, Mathematics Resource Teacher, Program Assistants, Educational Aides, Health Aides, Pupil Personnel Workers and aides, Other Non-Teaching Professional staff.

Parents: Parent Involvement Program, Parent Volunteers.

Curriculum, equipment and materials -- especially Competitive Partnership programs for individualized instruction.

Through these resources, schools and teachers should be better able to provide for the individual learning needs of the child. There are, however, many approaches to the individualization of instruction and many interpretations of what it means to "individualize". The Total Learning Center concept is sufficiently broad to encourage many of the approaches found in the literature.

The framework set forth for the Total Learning Center seems to embody three major approaches:

(1) Provide the teaching staff, support staff and non-teaching professional staff required, along with the material teaching resources necessary to provide services in a small group or individualized basis.

(2) Provide (and test the cost effectiveness of) packaged individualized instructional materials in the two target areas of reading and mathematics (the Competitive Partnership programs).

(3) Train the teaching staff in concepts and methods of individualized instruction.

Continuation and strengthening of these basic approaches toward serving the individual needs of the student is clearly supported. The sections that follow provide information relevant to the instructional program and to the services of nonteaching professionals.

PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOL INSTRUCTIONAL PROGRAM

Results for the instructional program were obtained from the Teachers Questionnaire.

Title I teachers completing the questionnaire were, for the most part, classroom teachers (88%), female (98%), between the ages of 20 and 50, (Table III-14) and hold B.A. degrees (74%). (Table III-15)

A majority of the teachers, 69%, were permanent and 79% were not seeking another type of certification. Of those who were, only 27 percent were seeking permanent certification. (Table III-16)

Reading Program

McGraw Hill was the reading Competitive Partnership used most this year (30 percent), although 23 percent used D. C. Heath and 18 percent used Random House. Fourteen percent of the teachers did not use a Competitive Partnership this year as compared to 27 percent last year. McGraw Hill and Random House increased in use this year with Random House showing the largest gain. The percentage of users of combination programs also increased from eight percent to 15 percent while the percentage of D. C. Heath users decreased. See Table III-17.

TABLE III-15

PROFESSIONAL DATA

Highest Degree	Percent
Less than B.A.	1%
B.A./B.S.	74%
M.A./M.S./M.Ed.	15%
M.A.+ or Ph.D.	10%
TOTAL	100%

TABLE III-16

CERTIFICATION

Type of Certification	Currently Holding Percent	Seeking Frequency
REGULAR		
Provisional	4%	2
Probationary	9%	6
Probationary Standard	10%	7
Temporary	8%	9
Permanent	69%	9
	100%	33
N	217	79% not seeking 15% seeking, not specified 6% seeking, specified
SPECIAL		
Reading teachers	32%	4%
Reading Specialists	17%	19%
Math Resource teachers	31%	4%
Math Teachers	10%	2%
English Teachers	2%	
Others	9%	
N	59	

TABLE III-17

READING COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP USED

Competitive Partnership	This Year	Last Year
D. C. Heath	23%	27%
McGraw Hill	30%	27%
Random House	18%	11%
Combination	15%	8%
None	14%	27%
TOTAL	100%	100%
N	540	419

Most of the reading Competitive Partnerships were started in September or October (61%) and over 75 percent had started by December. Only 30 percent of the materials had arrived, however, in September or October, and only 57 percent by December. By way of compensation for late arrival of materials, 70 percent of the teachers had access to last year's Competitive Partnership materials and 26 percent had some other material to use in September. (Table III-18)

The Competitive Partnership materials were not used to the exclusion of other materials. Two-thirds of the teachers used at least one other reading series, although less than five percent used another reading material. Almost all teachers (98%) used at least one basal series in addition to, and that was different from, their reading Competitive Partnership. Over 15 percent of the teachers used two basal series in addition to their Competitive Partnership. (Table III-19) The most popular basal series were the Bank Street Readers (used by 14%) and the Sheldon Reading Series (used by 11%).

Overall, the Competitive Partnership programs were rated by the teachers as excellent with respect to size and style of print, specific lesson objectives, and decoding activities. Deficiencies were apparent, however, in the areas of development of an appreciation and understanding of the pluralistic nature of American society, the development of an appreciation and understanding of good literature and enrichment activities. (Table III-20)

The most widely used and most emphasized teaching activities concerned listening and understanding. Less used and little emphasized activities concerned spelling and study skills. Writing skills received little emphasis by many teachers. (Table III-21)

TABLE III-18

ARRIVAL AND STARTING DATES OF READING COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIPS

	Sept/Oct	Nov/Dec	Jan & after
Month CP Started	61%	15%	24%
Month materials Arrived	30%	27%	43%

TABLE III-19

MATERIALS USED IN ADDITION TO READING CP

	Classroom Teachers
Other Series Used	
One	67%
Two	20%
Three	8%
Other materials used	5%
Basal Series Used	
One	84%
Two	7%
Basal Series Different from CP	98%

TABLE III-20

TEACHER RATINGS OF READING CP PROGRAMS

Area	Excellent & Good	Fair & Poor	No Observation
The development of a sound value system	65%	14%	21%
The development of an appreciation and understanding of good literature	48%	35%	17%
The development of an appreciation and understanding of pluralistic nature of American society	50%	33%	37%
Presentation of vocabulary	73%	11%	6%
Style of art or graphic lay out	77%	11%	12%
Size and style of print	87%	4%	9%
Specific lesson objectives	87%	6%	7%
Decoding activities	86%	6%	8%
Encoding activities	79%	10%	11%
Related language activities, i.e., creative writing discussions	69%	18%	13%
Enrichment activities, i.e., outside reading, research projects	51%	28%	21%
Adjustment to individual needs	78%	14%	8%
Audio-visual materials such as tapes, films, etc.	71%	13%	16%
Achievement and placement tests	64%	16%	9%

TABLE III-21

TEACHING ACTIVITIES IN READING

Activity	Used	3 Most Used	Not Used
Listening Skills	97%	51%	3%
Comprehension Skills	94%	58%	6%
Decoding or Word Attack Skills	90%	65%	10%
Oral Language Development	88%	27%	12%
Oral Reading Skills	87%	28%	13%
Silent Reading Skills	83%	22%	17%
Handwriting	83%	9%	17%
Spelling	71%	11%	29%
Study Skills	69%	10%	31%
Dictation	60%	12%	40%
Written Composition	54%	4%	46%

Over two-thirds (72%) of the teachers kept individual pupil profile books on all Title I students; 16% kept books on some Title I students; and only 12 percent of the teachers did not keep profiles on any students.

The most popular means or organizing Title I students for reading instruction was in small groups (47%), individualized (6%), or both (31%). Only 13 percent of the teachers used large groups alone or in combination with others.

A variety of information was gathered relating to library facilities and activities. Most of the teachers (83%) had classroom libraries which were funded through the regular school budget (26%), the teachers' personal resources (26%), or the Title I budget (11%). These classroom libraries were used in providing students with a daily silent reading period by 77 percent of the teachers, and in providing students with an opportunity to take the books home by 48 percent of the teachers. Many teachers, 71 percent, also allowed students to take their textbooks home.

For the most part, the school libraries were well equipped; 88 percent of the teachers were in schools with adequate libraries and 92 percent had full-time librarians. Class visits to the library were usually scheduled either weekly (48%) or biweekly (33%), but 65 percent of the teachers actually had library visits weekly. (Table III-22) In addition, 58 percent of the teachers allowed their students to visit the library at other times than scheduled.

Teachers also used a variety of related reading activities; 65 percent participated in the Read More in '74 Campaign and 42 percent participated in Book Fair. A smaller number (24%) used the Bookmobile, and only seven percent participated in "Reading Is Fundamental."

TABLE III-22

LIBRARY VISITS*

Frequency	Scheduled	Actual
None	9%	6%
Once a week	48%	65%
Every other week	33%	19%
No regular schedule	4%	

*58% teachers allowed students to visit library at other than scheduled times

Mathematics Program

Last year, of those teachers participating in the Competitive Partnership Program, 83 percent used D. C. Heath. Because of new entries in the CP percentage, this was reduced drastically this year with only 38 percent using D. C. Heath, with a 23 percent increase in Addison-Wesley users and a 17 percent increase in Random House users (Table III-23). There was also an overall ten percent increase in the number of Competitive Partnership participants.

A majority of the Competitive Partnership programs were started in September and October (53%). However, a significant number of programs (28%) were not begun until after January. Only 30 percent of the materials, however, were available at the start of the school year and, by December, only 57 percent of the materials had arrived. (Table III-24) By means of compensation, 58 percent of the teachers had access to last year's Competitive Partnership mathematics materials although this was probably helpful only to D. C. Heath users.

Presumably, the teachers were not bereft of materials to use while waiting for the Competitive Partnership materials to arrive since 87 percent had at least one other mathematics series, and 84 percent had at least one other mathematics item. (Table III-25)

The teachers used a basal series different from, and in addition to, the Competitive Partnership series in 83 percent of the cases. The most popular basal series were Understanding Mathematics by Laidlaw and Elementary School Mathematics by Harcourt, Brace and Javanovich.

The mathematics Competitive Partnership programs were generally rated high in all areas with the exception of audio-visual materials. Slightly lower ratings were also given in the areas of achievement and placement tests,

TABLE III-23

USE OF MATHEMATICS COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIPS

Competitive Partnership	Used This Year	Used Last Year
Addison-Wesley	30%	6%
D. C. Heath	38%	71%
Random House	23%	6%
Combination	5%	3%
None	4%	14%
TOTAL	100%	100%

TABLE III-24

ARRIVAL AND STARTING DATES OF MATHEMATICS COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIPS

	Sept/Oct	Nov/Dec	Jan. & after
Month CP Started	53%	19%	28%
Month materials Arrived	30%	27%	43%

TABLE III-25

OTHER MATHEMATICS MATERIALS AVAILABLE

	One	Two	Three or more
Other mathematics series to use until CP materials arrived	87%	9%	4%
Number mathematics series supplied with until CP materials arrived	84%	11%	4%
Mathematics series supplied with	96%	2%	2%
Basal series used 83% used basal series different from CP series	96%	2%	2%

manipulative media, and supplementary materials. (Table III-26) In relation to this, comments are made elsewhere that more D. C. Heath manipulatives are needed and that Addison Wesley should be used for manipulatives and Random House for testing.

A larger variety of groupings was used for mathematics instruction than for reading. Small groups, alone or in combination with individualized instruction, were, again, most popular, used by 49 percent of the teachers; but large groups, alone or in combination with individualized instruction, were used by 37 percent of the teachers.

Almost two-thirds of the teachers kept individual pupil profile books on all students and only 15 percent kept books on none.

Student exposure to mathematics experiences other than classroom instruction was provided for. Almost all teachers, 94 percent, indicated that students had free access to use manipulative media devices; and 78 percent of the teachers had well equipped classrooms for teaching mathematics. Outside of the classroom, however, student opportunities for mathematic experiences were apparently much more limited. Only 19 percent of the teachers had taken their students on a cultural enrichment field trip related to the mathematics program; and only 60 percent of the teachers allowed their students to take textbooks home.

The most common teaching activity was clearly sets, used by 93 percent of the teachers, and mathematics vocabulary was second, used by 88 percent. Other common teaching activities used by approximately 80 percent of the teachers were number sentences, computation skills, numeration, and number presentation. These were not, however, necessarily the most emphasized activities. The three most used activities were computation skills, operations, and sets. (Table III-27)

TABLE III-26

TEACHER RATINGS OF MATHEMATICS CP PROGRAMS

Area	Excellent & Good	Fair & Poor & Unsatisfactory
Behavioral objectives	94%	6%
Student involvement	93%	7%
Presentation of vocabulary	88%	12%
Style of art or graphic lay out	81%	19%
Size and style of print	88%	12%
Specific lesson objectives	94%	6%
Presentation of numbers	96%	4%
Manipulative media	78%	22%
Problem solving techniques	83%	17%
Chapter reviews and tests	82%	18%
Supplementary materials	78%	22%
Enrichment activities	90%	10%
Adjustment to individual needs	80%	20%
Audio-visual materials, etc.	54%	46%
Achievement and placement tests	75%	25%
Teacher's manual	92%	8%

TABLE III-27

TEACHING ACTIVITIES IN MATHEMATICS

Activity	Used	Most Used	Not Used
Sets	93%	26%	7%
Math Vocabulary	88%	22%	12%
Number Sentences	82%	22%	12%
Computation Skills	81%	44%	19%
Numeration	80%	19%	20%
Number Presentation	79%	14%	21%
Operations	71%	28%	29%
Problem Solving	71%	19%	29%
Measurement	64%	2%	36%
Geometry	54%	2%	46%
Application	43%	8%	67%
Structure	40%	2%	60%
Number Theory	26%	1%	73%
Probabilities and Statistics	8%	0%	92%

SUPPORT SERVICES PROGRAM

This section discusses the services provided by the non-teaching professionals and the para-professionals and how they devoted their time in providing these support services. The non-teaching professional services were provided by social workers, clinical psychologists, pupil personnel workers, speech therapists, and counselors. The para-professional services were provided by educational aides, health aides and pupil personnel aides.

More than three out of four of the non-teaching professionals and para-professionals spent 80% or more of their time working directly with students. Table III-28 shows how the non-teaching professionals devoted their time to Title I in 1972-73 and 1973-74.

Table III-28

TIME SPENT BY NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONALS WORKING WITH TITLE I

Percentage of Time	1972-73	1973-74
21-40	3.8%	5.4%
41-60	1.9%	3.6%
61-80	1.9%	5.4%
81-100	77.4%	83.9%
N	45	55

Table III-29 shows the percentage of the non-teaching professionals' time spent working with school personnel, students, and parents.

Table III-29

HOW NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONALS SPEND THEIR TIME

Percentage of Time	School Personnel %	Students %	Parents &
20% or less	42.6	3.6	44.4
21-40%	44.4	18.2	33.3
41-60%	9.3	36.4	14.8
61-80%	3.7	41.8	7.4
N	54	35	54

Seventy-five percent of the para-professionals spent between four and six hours per day working directly with students and between one and three hours working on administrative and clerical duties. Table III-30 shows how the para-professionals actually spent their time.

Table III-30

HOW PARA-PROFESSIONALS SPENT THEIR TIME

Number of Hours Per Day	Working with Students		Working on Administrative and Clerical Duties	
	f*	%	f	%
1	7	2.6	31	14.2
2	12	4.4	97	44.5
3	12	4.4	45	20.6
4	29	10.6	12	5.5
5	66	24.0	4	1.8
6	110	40.0	3	1.4
7	20	7.3	6	2.8
8	19	6.9	20	9.2

---

* Frequency

Table III-31 shows how the non-teaching professionals spent their time and how they feel they should spend it. Particular emphasis is given by the non-teaching professionals to spending more time than they now spend in planning and consultation with school personnel regarding programs for many children and for individual children.

Table III-31

HOW NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONALS SPEND THEIR TIME AND HOW THEY SHOULD SPEND THEIR TIME

Program Activities	Percentage of Persons Who Spent Their Time Most Often On An Activity	Percentage of Persons Who Felt They Should Spend Most of Their Time On An Activity	Difference
Planning and consultation with school personnel for problems and programs geared to many students	44.7	65.1	20.4
Referrals for assessment, testing or diagnosis of individual students	50.0	51.3	1.3
Post-assessment consultation with school personnel to discuss problems/diagnosis of individual pupils	53.2	72.5	19.3
Planning with and assisting school personnel and other professionals to develop treatment, therapy, or intervention programs for individual children	37.0	71.4	34.4
Consultations with parents regarding their children's problems	71.4	85.0	13.6
Home/community liaison and follow-up	74.5	85.0	10.5

According to both the non-teaching professionals and the para-professionals, discipline appears to be the most common student problem. Table III-32 shows the more common problems among Title I students as seen by the non-teaching professionals and the para-professionals.

Table III-32

STUDENT PROBLEMS AS SHOWN BY NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONALS AND PARA-PROFESSIONALS

Problems	Percentage of Non-Teaching Professionals Seeing it as a Problem
Disruptive Family Conditions	90
Discipline	87
Clothing	80
Lack of Adult Interest	80
The Need for Eyeglasses	80
Lack of Dental Care & Physical Health	80
Lack of Motivation	75
Poor Nutrition	66

	Percentage of Para-Professional Seeing it as a Problem
Discipline	80
Lack of Adult Interest	53
Lack of Motivation	47
Lack of Better Self-Image	42
Disruptive Family Conditions	33

Table III-33 shows the degree to which non-teaching professionals were able to provide services to Title I students needing their services.

Table III-33

PERCENTAGE AND NUMEBER OF NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONALS PROVIDING SERVICES TO TITLE I STUDENTS

Degree of Service	Number & Percentage Providing Service	
	N	%
Almost all students in need of services are served	20	38
About half of the students who need services are served	19	37
Only a small number of students in need are served	13	25

Table III-34 shows how the non-teaching professionals viewed the adequacy of follow-through with Title I students in providing the treatment, therapy, or intervention necessary to the amelioration of the original condition.

Table III-34

ADEQUACY OF FOLLOW-THROUGH PROVIDED TO STUDENTS

How Adequate	Percentage of Non-Teaching Professionals
Usually adequate	14
Often adequate	44
Sometimes adequate	32
Rarely adequate	10

Table III-35 shows how the non-teaching professionals and the paraprofessionals rated the cooperation they received from other staff members.

Table III-35

RATINGS OF STAFF COOPERATION AS GIVEN BY NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONALS AND PARA-PROFESSIONALS

Staff Members	Excellent	Good	Poor	Not Applicable
	-RATINGS BY NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONALS			
Title I Coordinators	30%	40%	9%	21%
Principals	54%	41%	4%	2%
Resource Teachers	38%	50%	8%	4%
Classroom Teachers	33%	67%	-	-
Parents	20%	70%	10%	-
Program Assistants	80%	7%	13%	-
	---RATINGS BY PARA-PROFESSIONALS-----			
Principals	57%	42%	1%	-
Teachers	49%	51%	-	-
Parents	22%	64%	4%	11%
Nurses	33%	50%	2%	15%
Psychologists	13%	43%	1%	43%
Social Workers	14%	41%	1%	43%
Speech Therapists	19%	46%	2%	34%

According to the non-teaching professionals, the major advantages encountered in working with the Title I Program were better job atmosphere, more help to parents, teachers and students, and the excellent supportive services in reading and mathematics.

The recommendations for improving the Title I Program made by paraprofessionals were increased parental interest, provide more time to work with students, provide better behavior controls, and improve administrative procedures. The most frequently suggested recommendations made by non-teaching professionals included providing better administration of the program, provide more professionals working full-time, more coordinated team work, better communications, and better facilities.

CHAPTER IV

SECONDARY SCHOOLS

There were 16 secondary schools where Title I programs were in operation during the 1973-74 academic year serving some 4094 seventh graders with an average of 256 students per school during the year. The major focus of the program was on increasing the reading and mathematics levels of identified students. Both the reading and mathematics resource teachers have worked quite cooperatively with the classroom teachers in their effort to achieve this objective. In fact, the enthusiasm and cooperation among all Title I staff has contributed, in many instances, to whatever success the program has achieved.

Personnel

Each of the 16 secondary schools has a principal who is assisted by a Program Assistant or Assistant Principal for coordinating the Title I activities. The cooperation of these coordinators was rated average to excellent by 13 of the principals surveyed. In some schools the Program Assistants were part-time, creating real hardships on the principal in administering the program. In other schools they lacked a Program Assistant entirely.

The Title I Secondary school principals had over two years' experience (mean 2.5 years) working with the Title I program and an average of 17.7 years experience in education, making them quite familiar with all the intricacies of a program of this magnitude. They had anywhere from 5 - 17 sections of the seventh grade classes, each with identified Title I students

---

*6617 less 819, 129?, 1287 + 3 x average of remainder to service. The resource teachers, who had an average of two years experience in the program had student loads ranging from 53 to 250. However, only two (10 percent) of the schools studied had full-time mathematics resource teachers, even though 90 percent of the schools had full-time reading resource teachers.

The number of Title I staff appears generally inadequate. In almost all schools additional mathematics resource teachers are needed and there is widespread concern over the seeming inability to hire and retain competent mathematics resource teachers. In about one-half of the schools, additional reading resource teachers are needed as well; and, in some instances, support staff, including pupil personnel workers, social workers, psychologists, and aides are needed.

Nine of the schools had at least one part-time pupil personnel worker and one part-time pupil personnel aide; 14 of the 16 schools had a part-time clinical psychologist and nine had one part-time speech therapist. About 12 of the schools reported that they had three full-time educational aides to assist the classroom and resource teachers.

TABLE IV-1

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF SECONDARY SCHOOL RESOURCE TEACHERS BY AVERAGE LENGTH OF EXPERIENCE

Title	# Schools	#Persons Fulltime	#Persons Parttime	# Years Experience Title I	Total
Math resource teachers	9	10	-	2.1*	10
Reading resource teachers		17	-	2.1*	17
Pupil personnel workers		2	10	5.6*	12
Pupil personnel aides		5	6	3.0*	11
Clinical psychologist			9	2.3*	9
Hearing Therapist			2	2.1*	2
Speech therapist			6	3.0*	6
Social Worker			2	4.2*	2
Sight Conservationist			1	6.0*	1
Educational Aides		24	4	3.0*	28
Community Aides		2	-	4.0*	2

*averages only

All five non-teaching professionals completing questionnaires were pupil personnel workers with B.A. or B.S. degrees. About nine of them them had eight years of experience working with Title I students, and the others had less than eight years. About thirteen of the non-teaching professionals are full time to the school system.

The pupil personnel workers experienced difficulty in providing services to the students in several ways, although the services they did provide were rated "average" to "good" by twelve of the principals. Thirty-four percent (1394) of the Title I students were considered to fall into the most critical pupil personnel case category while only 18 percent (538) fell into the least critical pupil personnel case category. Yet, a majority of the pupil personnel workers felt they were unable to provide services to more than 50% of the total identified students. In several schools, both principals and resource teachers indicated the pupil personnel services were a major contributing factor to program success. More of their services will be needed for increased effectiveness of the secondary school program. A further reflection of inadequacies in this area is the fact that only about 50% of the staff felt their professional skills were used well in serving the students while the other 50% did not.

Causes for these problems were identified and were a lack of understanding on the part of other Title I personnel regarding their role, difficulty in explaining the restriction of the program to 7th graders to parents, a lack of space to work in, and limited access to telephones which are necessary to maintaining contact with parents and community organizations.

Most of the pupil personnel worker's time is spent on home/community liaison and follow-up, and on consultations with parents regarding their children's problems. Less time is spent on such tasks as post-assessment consultation with school personnel to discuss problems/diagnosis of individual pupils; planning with and assisting school personnel and other professionals to develop treatment, therapy or intervention programs for individual children; referrals for assessment, testing or diagnosis of individual students; and planning and consultation with school personnel for problems and programs geared to many students. A need to increase the amount of time spent on this lask task, planning with school personnel for widespread problems and programs, was reflected in the responses of the pupil personnel workers.

Where student problems were identified, and follow-through in the form of treatment, therapy or intervention was necessary for amelioration of the original condition, one out of the five workers found it usually adequate and two found it sometimes adequate.

The para-professionals, which include pupil personnel aides and educational aides, tended to be women and over one-half were over the age of 40. Their experience ranged from less than one year to nine years, with a majority having two to three years experience. Most of the pupil personnel worker's time was spent working directly with the students, although an average of two hours a day was devoted to administrative and clerical duties. Over 75% of the pupil personnel aides felt their talents were well used. The assistance of the aides was helpful to the teachers and, in some instances, quite important, and their level of performance was rated good by a majority of the principals.

Slightly more than half of the educational aides were not working with the Competitive Partnership Reading Program. Those who were working with the program were using McGraw-Hill or both D. C. Heath and McGraw Hill.

One-half of the educational aides did not work with the Competitive Partnership Mathematics programs. Those aides who did work with the program utilized the D. C. Heath and Random House programs.

Over 50 percent (16) of the aides sometimes actively participated in the classroom planning with the teachers, and thirty percent (10) always actively participated in planning. More than half of the aides were responsible for preparing worksheets, maintaining instructional materials, supplies and equipment, preparing bulletin board displays, administering teacher-made tests, and setting up equipment for a reading, math, science or social studies class.

The performance of the resource teachers was generally excellent according to the principals and such performance was a major program strength at several schools. In some instances, however, high turnover rates or inexperience hampered program effectiveness.

Parent volunteer workers performed adequately, according to the principals. Principals, resource teachers, and nonteaching professionals all noted that the Title I program itself has increased parental involvement in the schools. Such increased involvement, combined with better parent-school communication, has been a positive result of Title I. In some schools, however, the experience has not been so positive, and there does exist a lack of parent support and effective and consistent dealings between parents and the schools. Concommitant with increased involvement and better communication is an increased articulation by parents of dissatisfaction with the program.

Instructional Program

The secondary school program was centered around reading and mathematics. The resource teachers in both areas thus became the main force in carrying out the program. Chapter II gives the results of standardized tests in detail, pointing out the gain scores and grade point average for secondary school children.

A number of principals and resource teachers have emphasized improved reading and math skills as a major program advantage. Almost all the principals and resource teachers felt that it is unfair to measure the student gains by the standardized tests alone. In fact, when asked to rate the reliability of the tests and the validity of the results, five of the principals felt they were below average, one felt they were poor, five felt they were average, and another five felt they were good. There were factors such as student motivation, cooperation, socialization and services to the community which could not be measured by the test results. Achievement in those areas were really more significant insofar as the success in life was concerned. No systematic method has been set up, to date, to measure the gain in those areas and it is crucial to have a system for assessing them.

About ten of the principals felt that the reading and math programs their school is involved in are "excellent". They credited it to the well trained reading and math resource teachers, pupil personnel workers, aides, and the local school consultants. The resource teachers have reported to have noticed more "confidence" in the program and they were satisfied with the "spacious" laboratories and the assistance of an aide as incentives to do a good job.

The support staff expressed similar feelings of satisfaction. The pupil personnel workers found it "rewarding" to work with the students on individual and small group bases and found it to contribute to student progress, both academically and socially. The resource teachers likewise emphasized the increased ability to identify student need and the advantage of small group and individualized instruction with its correlative improvements in academic achievement, in attendance, and in student attitudes and behavior.

The non-academic components of Title I have also been contributing factors in program success. The extracurricular activities have generally been advantageous to Title I students although some schools have provided a greater number of activities than others. In some schools, activities have been curtailed because of a lack of funds or inadequate transportation facilities. The clothing program has, in some schools, been very important and has generally worked well. This program was, apparently, an important non-academic component since three of the five pupil personnel workers indicated clothing to be a major and common student problem.

About 60 percent (15) of the resource teachers and over 80 percent (13) of the principals felt that they do not have adequate funds to complete the projected tasks in their respective programs, although 12 of the principals felt that the budget was properly utilized.

The level of overall program organization and coordination at the various levels was generally thought to be effective. In some schools, the development of a cohesive staff and support from pupil personnel services and aides were major program strengths, as was the ability of the coordinator in other schools. Eighty percent (13) of the principals rated coordination efforts between classroom and resource teachers as very good. An even greater number of principals, as well as nonteaching professionals, gave a positive appraisal of cooperation from LEA, the SEA Title I office and the Superintendent of Instruction. On a lower level, between aides and resource or classroom teachers, there appears to be an absence of regular active participation on the part of aides in classroom planning, although only 1/2 of the aides were utilized in the Title I program. In some schools, the resource teachers have difficulty in keeping the aides busy.

The California Test of Basic Skills was the most popular diagnostic procedure, used by 63 percent (16) of the resource teachers. The D.C. Criterion Reference Test was used by 32 percent (8) of the resource teachers, and three of the 14 reading resource teachers interviewed did not use any standardized test. Almost 90 percent (25) of the resource teachers supplemented the diagnostic tests. Fifty-three percent (12) used teacher made tests. The other most commonly used tests employed by the reading resource teachers were the Botel Phonics test (12), the Kottmeyer test (8), and the Morrison-McCall test (7).

TABLE IV-2

NUMBER OF TEACHERS USING DIFFERENT DIAGNOSTIC TESTS IN TITLE I SECONDARY SCHOOLS

Diagnostic Procedures	Reading	Mathematics	Total
California Achievement Test	1*	1	2
California Test of Basic Skills	9	3	12
D.C. Criterion Reference Test	5	1	6
Publishers Test -- D. C. Heath	-	1	1
No tests used	3	-	3

*The number of times tests were used was calculated from a total of 19 teachers (14 reading and 5 math) responding to this particular item of the survey.

TABLE IV-3

NUMBER OF TEACHERS USING SUPPLEMENTAL TESTS

Supplemental Tests	Reading	Mathematics	Total
Teacher made tests (and other informal methods)	7	3	10
Botel Phonics	7	-	7
Kottmeyer	5	-	5
Morrison McCall	4	-	4
Gates McGinite	2	-	2
I.R.I.	2	-	2
Prescriptive Reading Test	1	-	1
Dolch 220 Word List	1	-	1
Educational Development Lab	1	-	1
No tests used	1	1	2
California Arithmetic Test	-	1	1
S.R.A.	-	1	1
Prescriptive Math Test	-	1	1

TABLE IV-4

STUDENT GROUPINGS FOR DIFFERENT INSTRUCTIONAL ACTIVITIES AS REPORTED BY RESOURCE TEACHERS

Type of Grouping	Reading	Mathematics	Total
Skill level or ability	8	1	9
Individualized or small groups	4	4	8
Test results	3	-	3
Academic grade level	2	-	2
Interest grouping	2	-	2
Teacher observation	1	-	1

TABLE IV-5

AREAS OF STUDENT LEARNING DIFFICULTIES
AS REPORTED BY RESOURCE TEACHERS

Learning Problem	Reading	Mathematics	Total
Comprehension	5*	-	
Spelling	2	-	
Vocabulary	2	-	
Word Recognition	2	-	
Phonics and Language skills	2	-	
Listening skills	2	1	3
Discipline	2	1	3
Attention span	1	1	2
Computation (particularly division)	-	1	

*The number of times tests were used was calculated from a total of 11 teachers (9 reading and 2 math) responding to this particular item of the survey.

Only 63 percent (15) of the resource teachers felt the diagnostic procedures were adequate and 21 percent (5) thought that they were not effective. In some instances, the resource teachers stated the CTBS was inadequate as a diagnostic tool or irrelevant to the students.

The resource teachers grouped their students in various ways. All of the math teachers responding used individualized or small group instruction while only 28 percent (4) of the reading teachers used that method. The majority of reading teachers (56 percent or 8) grouped their students according to skill level or ability. Other methods used, alone or in combination with others, were grouping by test results (21 percent or 5), academic grade level (14 percent or 3), or by student interests (14 percent or 3).

While the resource teachers identified academic learning difficulties such as comprehension, spelling, and listening skills experienced by students, it would appear from the collective responses of para-professionals, nonteaching professionals and resource teachers that non-academic learning difficulties were greater inhibitors to achievement. One of these inhibitors, identified by 27 percent (7) of the resource teachers, was discipline In addition, all of the pupil personnel workers found discipline to be one of the five most common problems and the para-professionals also identified discipline as a major area of concern.

Yet, while discipline was identified by all Title I personnel from principals to para-professionals as a learning difficulty, the underlying causes for both this and academic learning problems were also pinpointed by the responses of Title I personnel. Both para-professionals and nonteaching professionals pointed to a lack of motivation and disruptive family conditions as major barriers to learning. In addition the need for students

TABLE IV-6

MAJOR STRENGTHS OF THE TITLE I PROGRAM IN SECONDARY SCHOOLS AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS AND RESOURCE TEACHERS

		Principals	Resource Teachers
1.	Plentiful supply of instructional materials	14	21
2.	Adequate equipment for the teachers & students to use	15	27
3.	Resource teachers (math & reading) contributed much to the teaching & learning environment of the school	10	14
4.	Cooperation among the staff was "excellent"	12	18
5.	Parent volunteers did an outstanding job	14	14
6.	Community involvement (parent participation) in Title I program was "very good"	14	21
7.	Improved reading & math skills	10	25
8.	Spacious laboratories	12	14
9.	Small group individualized instruction	8	25
10.	Other (cultural enrichment, clothing, breakfast, field trips, etc.)	13	9

TABLE IV-7

MAJOR PROBLEMS IN TITLE I SCHOOLS AS REPORTED BY PRINCIPALS RESOURCE TEACHERS, PROFESSIONALS, AND PARA-PROFESSIONALS

Problems	Para-Prof.	Non-teaching Prof.	Res. Teacher	Principal
Discipline	6	5	7	16
Lack of motivation	7	4	27	16
Disruptive family conditions	4	4	14	4
Clothing	1	5	3	12
Overcrowded classroom	1	N/A	1	1
Poor nutrition	0	3	7	10
Need better self-image	5	5	13	8
Need an adult interested in them	4	4	10	11
Lack of basic skills	1	N/A	9	8
Vision	N/A	4	7	2
Dental Care	N/A	4	3	4
Physical Health/Other problems	N/A	4	5	2
Speech	N/A	5	8	7
Reading retardation	N/A	3	12	9
Emotional problems	N/A	4	10	3
Social adjustment	N/A	4	25	13
No substitute teachers	N/A	N/A	18	14
Too much paperwork	N/A	5	4	12
Poor communication with Title I office	2	4	23	11
Eligibility list of students arrived late	N/A	2	10	15
Limited interest in secondary schools by the Title I office	1	3	15	8

TABLE IV-8

SECONDARY SCHOOL READING AND MATH STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS FOR 1973-1974*

Grade	Statistics	Reading Pre-test Score	Reading Post-test Score	Reading Gain	Math Pre-test Score	Math Post-test Score	Math Gains
7	Mean	4.65	5.37	.71	4.69	5.54	.83
7	N (#)	2287	2127	2004	2095	1790	1601

*The figures are based on the standardized test data provided by the PSDC's Research and Evaluation Office.

to have a better self image and the need to have an adult interested in them are common to many Title I students. Vision, dental care, and other physical health problems have also created learning barriers.

The results of these learning inhibitors are reflected in teacher ratings of students' academic difficulties. Comprehension was the major area of concern, identified by 55 percent of the reading resource teachers. Less paramount concerns were in the areas of spelling, vocabulary, word recognition, and phonics (22 percent of the reading resource teachers). Twenty-seven percent of all resource teachers noted deficiencies in listening skills. Several math resource teachers commented that the reading level of the D. C. Heath Competitive Partnership Program was too difficult for the students.

Effective motivation of students would necessarily require consideration of both academic and non-academic learning difficulties. The five most common motivating techniques used by the resource teachers were: (1) always having a positive attitude and never belittling the students; (2) providing tasks which were success-oriented, relevant and interesting; (3) relating materials to their experiences; (4) providing stimulating equipment and materials; and (5) providing pleasant physical surroundings.

Resource teachers have encountered difficulties with math labs and Educational Development Learning Labs. Eighty percent of the principals indicated the classroom facilities were "good". The pupil personnel workers saw a need for private work space. Overall space was a problem at one school, and increased library space was needed in another school. Late arrival of the math lab created disruption in one instance, and the absence of math labs is to be found in two other schools. Generally speaking, however, the facilities were quite adequate.

Availability of necessary equipment was generally "excellent" throughout the schools although there is a widespread concern that funds be provided for maintenance and repair of equipment. Thirty-three percent of the principals found the equipment adequate; 13 percent found the reading equipment adequate and 13 percent expressed a need for additional equipment. In at least one instance, basic equipment was not received in accordance with the agreement and Title I mandates.

The variety of materials and supplies has been one of the most advantageous features of the Title I program. In a few instances, however, principals and resource teachers encountered a lack or observed inequities in the distribution of the materials and supplies. Several Title I principals and teachers have expressed dissatisfaction in the procurement and distribution system used for supplying Title I materials.

Major Findings and Recommendations

1. Inadequate staffing has been seen as one of the major problems facing the secondary school Title I program. There seems to be a widespread shortage of math resource teachers. There were junior high schools in the system who managed the whole year without a math resource teacher to service the Title I students. Both principals and coordinators are extremely concerned about the situation, but were unable to do much to remedy the problem.

It is, therefore, recommended that an intensive search should be made within the system and outside to find sufficient number of math teachers to work with Title I junior high school students, before the school year starts. At the end of each school year a survey should be conducted to determine the staff needs for the coming year, and summer months should be set aside for the actual recruitment and selection of the needed staff. A data bank on interested candidates should be maintained by the coordinator to fill in the vacancies as soon as they occur.

2. Teacher turn-over has been rated as one of the difficult problems many Title I schools were faced with. Once a teacher resigns, it takes several months before the position could be filled. Vacancies occur more often in Title I schools than in non-Title I schools because of the temporary status the Title I teachers are given. Another reason is relatively low salary levels at which the teachers are paid.

It is, therefore, recommended that provision should be made to give "probationary" and "permanent" status to Title I teachers, just like the regular teachers; and their salaries should be comparable or better because of their involvement in a unique program of great importance. Once the salaries are made attractice and job stability is assured, the teacher turnover will decline and more and more competent teachers will come forward to work with the Title I students.

3. The actual number of aides to assist in the daily activities of the resource teachers were comparatively better than that of elementary and non-public schools (see Table IV-1). However, many of them were untrained and ill-prepared to take up the assignments when they were given. Consequently, their overall effectiveness was less than the general expectation.

It is, therefore, recommended that a special training program be set up for teacher aides, each time prior to making changes in the program activities. This may be done at the local or central level, but aside from the regular staff development activities in which they should always be a part.

4. No provision is available at present for arranging substitute teachers when resource teachers are taken ill or have to attend a staff development session (see Table IV-7). Some teachers take off without making sufficient arrangements to cover their classes, thus depriving students of the supplementary services they should be getting.

It is, therefore, recommended that funds should be made available in the annual budget to hire substitute teachers when the need arises. It will enable the resource teachers to attend the periodic staff development sessions, and to attract some competent teachers to the Title I program in the future.

5. Many schools have a Program Assistant to help the principal in coordinating the Title I activities. However, some schools have no Program Assistant or only a part-time person to fill the position. It places too much burden on the principals, making it virtually impossible for them to

give sufficient attention to the administrative and program needs of the school.

It is, therefore, recommended that a full-time Program Assistant be appointed at each Title I junior high school to work closely with the principal on administrative matters, and Title I program activities.

6. There is consensus among principals and teachers studied as to the deficiencies in program management and organization. Some of the major ones identified were (see Table IV-7):

(1) the list of eligible Title I students was not received on time;

(2) guidelines from the Title I office are unclear and communication with the Title I office was, in the case of several schools, poor.

(3) the central office appeared more interested in the elementary school program than in the secondary school program.

(4) Too much paperwork and added administrative work, as well as excess bureaucracy in the overall Title I administration.

In addition to those, there was general concern focused on expansion of the program -- either to cover all seventh graders or identified 8th and 9th graders. In a substantial number of schools (25%) there are apparently many identified students who are not in the program. This was caused, in some instances, by a lack of classroom space.

It is, therefore, recommended that the secondary coordinator re-examine the priorities on the basis of the problems identified and the selection criteria used for each year. Every effort should be made to provide the list of selected students within the first two weeks of classes in each school year, and to seek out for the needs of local schools so that they can be better served through Title I Supplementary Services.

It is further recommended that the Title I Office examine the resource allocations for secondary schools to find possible avenues to extend the services to all eligible students currently attending seventh grade in P.S.D.C.

7. Several pupil personnel workers (50%) and principals (30%) have cited the disection of the program (1-3 and 7) as reducing the value of the program. If students were in a continuous program or if the program was confined to the lower grades, greater reinforcement of learning and increased skill levels might be achieved. About 60% of classroom and resource teachers expressed dissatisfaction in the break between third and seventh grades.

It is, therefore, recommended that plans should be made to expand the Title I program kindergarten through seventh grade eliminating the break between third and seventh grades. A pilot program should be implemented in one or two schools, the results of which should support an increased budget request for the next fiscal year.

8. Facilities and equipment in most secondary schools were quite adequate. In some schools they have more equipment than they actually can use. In some others there are equipment inoperative from the day the school received it. Forty percent of the principals surveyed pointed out that they have no money to repair the equipment broken down.

It is, therefore, recommended that only a minimum amount of money be used in buying new equipment for schools which were in Title I for an extended period of time. The money thus saved should be set aside for "petty cash" for principals to locally repair any equipment that needs repair services. Every school should be provided with a "safety locker" to keep their costly equipment to protect them from vandalism.

CHAPTER V

PROGRAMS IN THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS

EVALUATION AREAS AND DATA SOURCES

The Title I Program in the non-public schools was analyzed in terms of resource allocations; eligibility criteria for students; the actual performance of the students on standardized tests; and the coordinative mechanisms with the public school program. The findings and recommendations presented in this section address these areas.

Table V - 1 summarizes the data sources that were used to secure the findings.

Table V - 1

DATA SOURCES FOR NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL ANALYSIS

Source

1. Standardized tests
2. Questionnaire results
    - Resource teachers
    - Principals
    - Educational Aides
    - Non-teaching professionals
    - Parents
3. Interview results
    - Principals
    - Resource teachers
    - Other administrators
4. Reports and other documents provided by the PSDC Title I Office (Secondary Data)

The number of questionnaires completed by the educational aides, non-teaching professionals, and parents was too small to be included in the analysis.

DESCRIPTION OF THE NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAM

The Non-Public school program operated in nine schools for FY 1974. Grades 1 through 8 were eligible for Title I services. The program was administered through the PSDC Title I Office by a Reading Program Coordinator and a Mathematics Program Coordinator. The major emphasis given to reading and mathematics in the Public Schools was also reflected in the program in the non-public schools. For academic year 1973-74, approximately 1,000 non-public school students were identified as being eligible for Title I services. The budget for the year was $349,226. The projected per pupil expenditure (PPE) was $350; the same projected PPE as for the public schools.

Within the schools, identified students were released from regular classes in order to receive special instruction from the reading and mathematics resource teachers. While some of the reading and mathematics resource teachers had access to the same materials used in the Competitive Partnership (CP) program in the PSDC, the CP program was neither contracted for nor operating in the non-public school Title I Program, according to the available information. Tests used to measure student performance were the California Achievement Tests (CAT), the California Test of Basic Skills (CTBS), and the Metropolitan Achievement Tests (MAT), mathematics sections.

SELECTION CRITERIA AND STUDENTS SERVED

Selection criteria for students attending Non-Public schools paralelled those used by the PSDC. In the PSDC, students were first defined as living in an "eligibility area," designated as a Public School Title I area. Next, as with the public schools, those students scoring at the 50th percentile or below on the standardized pretests were selected as Title I eligible students. Although approximately 1,000 students were identified in Non-Public schools (according to the 1974 Plan of Operation), the Non-Public school Coordinators indicated that only about 50-60 percent of these students were actually served. As a result, actual per pupil expenditures were more in the range of $580 to $700 rather than the projected $350 expenditure per pupil. Furthermore, Non-Public school personnel were not aware of the selection criteria for schools, even though this is public information.

The non-public school personnel reported a number of problems in serving all eligible students. These problems included the following:

1. Two schools reported inadequate facilities for conducting special classes in reading and/or mathematics.
2. One school was actually merged into another during the school year, reducing the number of operating Title I schools from 9 to 8.
3. Resource teachers usually had to divide their time between two schools, making it difficult to serve all eligible students.

The Title I office and non-public school program should give attention to overcoming these problems in order to serve the full number of Title I eligible students.

RESOURCE ALLOCATION

Table V - 2 shows the Non-Public Schools budget obtained from the ESEA Comprehensive Program for FY 1974. Although a report of actual expenditures was not available for all line items in the '74 Plan of Operation, it is our understanding that the personnel funds were not fully expended inasmuch as the Non-Public School Coordinator and five Resource Teachers were not hired.

The budget for teaching materials appears to be modest correlating with principals' and teachers' reports that additional teaching materials and supplies are needed. Coordinators and resource teachers reported that they worked closely in identifying and purchasing needed instructional materials.

A major problem for the non-public schools was the limited number of resource teachers actually hired. Ten resource teachers were employed for the eight schools in the program rather than the 15 budgeted. However, because both reading and mathematics specializations are required, some of the teachers divided their time between two schools. Furthermore, although there is provision in the budget for a coordinator, for the entire program, this position was not filled.

Table V - 2

BUDGET FOR NON-PUBLIC SCHOOLS*

POSITION	NUMBER ALLOTED	COST OF EACH	TOTAL
a. Personnel			
(1) TSA-Coordinator	1	$19,118	$ 19,118
(2) TSA-10 Assistant Coordinator (Reading)	1	17,671	17,671
(3) TSA-10 Assistant Coordinator (Mathematics)	1	17,671	17,671
(4) TSA-15 Teachers (Reading)	8	13,266	106,128
(5) TSA-15 Teachers (Mathematics)	7	13,266	92,862
(6) GS-6 Secretary	1	10,830	10,830
(7) GS-4 Educational Aides	7	8,193	57,351
b. Cultural Enrichment			
(1) School based performances (contracted)			4,000
(2) Admissions			2,000
c. Other Cost Items			
(1) Travel and transportation of students			2,000
(2) Educational supplies and materials			16,237
(3) Classroom equipment			2,150
(4) Books (texts and paperbacks)			500
(5) Miscellaneous services, repair & installation			1,000
SUB-TOTAL			$ 349,226

---

* Source: ESEA Comprehensive Program FY 1974.

TEST ANALYSIS

The standardized tests used by the Non-Public schools were the same as those used by the PSDC:

1. Reading - Grade 2 - California Achievement Test; Grades 3-8 - California Test of Basic Skills.
2. Mathematics - Metropolitan Achievement Tests for all grades.

The results of the reading tests by grade are presented in Table V - 3. The following observations can be made.

1. The average gain was .94, more than one month higher than the eight months between pretest and posttest.
2. The average gain achieved failed to make up for the average grade level deficiency of 1.26. The difference is equal to more than 3 months.
3. Grade equivalent deficiencies tend to increase with school grade. Grades 4 through 8 were behind from one to two years.
4. Although the Title I students made reasonable progress, more intensive work will be required with these students to bring them up to grade level. Prevention of reading problems should be emphasized in grades 2-4, while correction of deficiencies (including poor reading habits and poor motivation) should be emphasized in grades 5-8.

The results of the mathematics tests by grade are shown in Table V - 4. The observations for mathematics are similar to those made for reading.

1. The average gain for all grades was 0.94, again more than one

Table V - 3

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL READING TEST RESULTS
GRADE EQUIVALENTS*

Grade	Number of Schools		Pretest	Posttest	Gain
2	6				
		M**	1.51	2.59	1.07
		SD***	.46	.63	.69
		N****	35.	35.	35.
3	6				
		M	2.13	2.93	.80
		SD	.67	.80	.89
		N	45.	45.	45.
4	6				
		M	2.96	4.24	1.27
		SD	1.01	.90	1.12
		N	50.	50.	50.
5	6				
		M	3.57	4.38	.82
		SD	.85	1.05	1.15
		N	59.	59.	59.
6	6				
		M	4.58	5.15	.57
		SD	.80	.87	.74
		N	29.	29.	29.
7	4				
		M	4.28	5.42	1.13
		SD	.99	1.75	1.52
		N	25.	25.	25.
8	1				
		M	6.07	6.59	.52
		SD	.10	.32	.74
		N	5.	5.	5.

* Statistical Results reported here are for all grades.
** Mean
*** Standard Deviation
**** Number

Table V - 4

NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL MATHEMATICS TEST RESULTS GRADE EQUIVALENTS*

Grade	Number of Schools		Pretest	Posttest	Gain
2	1				
		M**	1.55	1.60	.06
		SD***	.23	.23	.37
		N****	7.	7.	7.
3	3				
		M	2.52	2.82	.30
		SD	.38	.43	.34
		N	20.	20.	20.
4	8				
		M	2.92	4.12	1.19
		SD	.67	1.06	.75
		N	78.	78.	78.
5	7				
		M	3.71	4.63	.92
		SD	.68	.81	.70
		N	82.	82.	82.
6	7				
		M	4.59	5.44	.85
		SD	.60	.79	.52
		N	78.	78.	78.
7	5				
		M	5.31	6.46	1.15
		SD	.98	1.59	1.01
		N	48.	48.	48.
8	6				
		M	6.10	7.03	.93
		SD	1.01	1.35	.70
		N	57.	57.	57.

* Statistical Results reported here are for all grades
** Mean
*** Standard Deviation
**** Number

month higher than the eight month period between pretest and posttest.

2. The gain of .94 compares with a deficiency of 1.36, a difference of more than 4 months.
3. Deficiencies tend to increase with grade.
4. More intensive work will be required to bring the Title I students up to grade level.

A technical problem worth noting in the analysis of the standardized test data was that scoring of the tests is incomplete. All schools recorded pretest and posttest grade equivalents and percentiles for total reading and mathematics scored. However, there was too little information provided on subscores for a detailed analysis.

REACTIONS OF PRINCIPALS AND RESOURCE TEACHERS TO THE TITLE I PROGRAM

The following information was taken from both the questionnaires and interviews of the non-public school principals and resource teachers regarding the Title I Program. The statements reported here were made most frequently by the respondents in the particular category. They have been presented here to give an indication of how the Title I Program was perceived by the professional staff involved.

SIGNIFICANT FEATURES OF THE TITLE I PROGRAM

The principals mentioned that the assistance that was gained from Mathematics and Reading Resource teachers is a major asset to the program. This assistance facilitated another significant feature, the progress of the children in the areas of reading and mathematics. Principals also perceived the cultural enrichment program as a major strength of the Title I Program. Other strengths of the Title I Program included the availability of materials, the excellent rapport between Title I staff and regular staff, the positive change in attitude of the Title I children and the assistance of the pupil personnel worker.

More than 1/3 of the principals cited the increased parent interest in the total school program. They also cited more cooperation from the Title I parents. Such increased interest and cooperation has made parents more aware of the Title I program. Some of the principals suggested that non-Title I parents be given a chance to support the PAC. The principals would like the PAC to provide a greater outreach and to see the parents become more active in the program. However, it is not certain whether the Office of Education Guidelines would permit the involvement of non-Title I parents in the Title I Program.

Positive features of the FY 1974 Program reported by Resource Teachers included the following:

1. Small group instruction in reading and mathematics.
2. Availability of many and varied materials.
3. Improved attitudes of the children and teachers.
4. Cooperation and flexibility in the program
5. Good in-service training.
6. Guidelines for identifying children.
7. Progress in area of reading.

PROBLEMS ENCOUNTERED IN THE PROGRAM

There were some problems encountered during the year. Materials arrived at the schools late or they were not received at all. There was lack of facilities for the program in some schools. One problem that concerned some of the principals was that the resource teachers worked only part-time. They felt that this was not sufficient for remediation. Seven out of eight principals said that they did not have adequate Title I staff to carry out the Title I operations. They wanted full-time aides in all classrooms, full-time resource teachers for each school and a speech therapist. Some principals suggested pupil personnel workers, school psychologist, and medical staff in order for the Title I Program to operate effectively. The majority of the principals felt that their staff cooperated very well or excellently to make the Title I Program a success. Following is a summary or problems reported by principals:

1. Late arrival of materials.
2. Inadequate local facilities and lack of Title I funds to rectify it.
3. Part-time resource teachers.
4. No input from principals in budget preparation and use.
5. Lack of direct line of communication between coordinators, principals, and staff.
6. No full-time non-public school coordinator.

The following problems were reported by Resource Teachers:

1. Lack of time.
2. Delay in receiving materials.
3. Lack of communications between Title I office and non-public schools.

4. Lack of familiarity with the PSDC plan of operations.
5. Need for software and more hardware.
6. Fragmentation of services.
7. Non-cooperative aides.

SUGGESTED CHANGES

Some of the principals were concerned over budget input and availability as well as the lack of communication between the school and the Title I coordinator.

The principals felt that many of these problems could be lessened or eliminated by establishing direct lines of communications between coordinators, principals, and Title I staff. The principals thought that a full-time coordinator and full-time Title I staff could lessen some of the problems. A few principals felt that a solution was allowing non-public schools to identify children by their school criteria. The principals also felt that having an input into the Title I Program would eliminate or lessen several of the problems.

Resource teachers from Non-Public Schools suggested the following changes:

1. Children should qualify for the entire program rather than for a specific part of it, such as reading instruction.
2. Improved space.
3. Cultural experiences, social factors, economic factors and performance in school be used as bases for the selection of students.

4. Resource teachers should consist of one for each building rather than part-time in two or more buildings.
5. Additional equipment.
6. Prompt delivery of equipment (September).
7. Additional aides.
8. Additional software for each school.
9. Meetings with principals as a group and discussion of the roles and responsibilities.
10. Non-public and public programs should not be treated differently.
11. Improved coordination in the program.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The following recommendations are based on the findings presented and are intended to aid the PSDC Title I office and the Non-Public School component personnel plan its activities for the coming year.

1. Contingent upon the number of children identified as eligible for Title I services and the funding level of the total program, additional staff is needed for the Non-Public School program. A full-time coordinator should be employed for the Non-Public School component. It would be desirable to employ one full-time reading resource teacher and one full-time mathematics resource teacher in each school, assuming that the Title I Program continues to emphasize reading amd mathematics skills.

2. Strengthen the coordination between the Title I office and the Non-Public Schools. Employment of a full-time coordinator for this component would aid in this area.

3. The Title I office and Non-Public School staff should give attention to serving a larger proportion of the eligible students. Although limitations in staff, budget, and space have placed constraints on Non-Public School operations, solutions to these problems need to be found in order to improve upon the delivery of services to all eligible students.

4. Supplies and materials for the school year should be delivered at the respective schools prior to the actual starting of classes. It is quite frustrating for the staff to go without the necessary materials for part of the school year, especially at the beginning when most of the planning is done for the entire year. Perhaps certain arrangements could be made to order the materials in sufficient quantity, particularly the non-instructional supplies, so that there will be plenty of "left-over" to meet the crisis period.

CHAPTER VI

COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF THE COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS

INTRODUCTION

The Competitive Partnership (CP) program is a joint school/industry effort to test the effectiveness of various publishers' programs with Title I students. Publishers of reading and mathematics programs were asked to submit proposals to the schools. The schools reviewed the publishers' programs and proposals and selected the programs of four publishers in reading and mathematics, as follows:

Publisher	Reading	Mathematics
D. C. Heath	X	X
Random House	X	X
McGraw-Hill	X	
Addison-Wesley		X

The CP program was started in school year 1972-73. The programs are being tested over a three-year period, ending in school year 1974-75. At that time, based on the cost effectiveness analysis, a decision will be made by PSDC regarding the selection of the publishers' program(s) to be adopted. Separate selections will be made for reading and mathematics.

The CP program analysis is being conducted for public elementary schools, grades 1-3. Public secondary schools may participate in the CP program at a later time. Non-public schools are not participating in the CP program.

The programs emphasize individualized instruction. Pamphlets, workbooks, teaching aids, games, etc. are included for use with individual students or small groups. Each student can work at his own pace under the guidance and supervision of the teacher. Some programs provide their own tests and student progress records.

Contracts with the publishers include a Staff Development component as well as the purchase of materials. Staff Development was included so that teachers and other staff members could learn how to use the materials and programs effectively.

This chapter presents a summary of the Cost Effectiveness Analysis of the Competitive Partnership Programs for reading and mathematics, including recommendations for each area. Detailed recommendations are presented for further operation and testing of Competitive Partnership Programs. Details of the analyses for costs and standardized test data are presented next.

COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS MODEL

The Context, Input, Process, Product (CIPP) model was used as the analytic model for cost effectiveness analysis. This model, in contrast with simpler conceptions of cost effectiveness, formulates effectiveness measures as part of a process of overall program development. Context variables consider the background of objectives, goals, and constraints within which various decisions are made. Input variables consider the relative costs, program characteristics, staff development efforts, staff qualifications and related Title I programs, materials and services. Process variables include program and service utilization, delivery and continuity, and teaching practices. Product variables are measured in the form of standardized test data.

The CIPP model makes allowances for the fact that cost effectiveness analyses are often carried out under practical field conditions and that it is not always possible to "control" or "hold constant" the many variables that may effect the final results. To the practical decision maker it is often just as important to know the differences in context, input, and process as it is to measure the final product. Such an analysis provides clues as to the possible reasons that one program may seem more cost effective than another. The resulting analysis produces an effectiveness profile rather than a single measure of effectiveness.

Primary emphasis is given to the analysis of input, process and product relationships to gain a better understanding of how the CP costs and program input interact with other Title I component elements and non-Title I elements. (Note: Additional discussions of the application of the CIPP model to the Cost Effectiveness Analysis of Competitive Partnership programs is presented in the Second Interim Report, dated September 20, 1974.)

In the analysis that follows, CP costs were annualized and are expressed on the basis of annualized per student costs, a concept parallel to per pupil expenditures. The standardized test results are presented in the summary sections for two years, 1972-73 and 1973-74. (See Chapter II for the list of tests.) The 1972-73 standardized test data was obtained from the Title I evaluation report for that year.[1]

---

[1] Evaluation Report, ESEA Title I Program for 1972-1973 Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Vol. 1. Federal City College, Washington, D.C., Contract No. 73223, April 30, 1974.

The remaining data was obtained from "Building Profiles" provided by the Title I office or from the Teachers Questionnaire developed and administered by ACRA.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS: COST EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP READING PROGRAMS

SUMMARY

The cost profile for reading programs is shown in Table VI - 1. The D.C. Heath reading program is the least expensive in terms of annualized costs per student ($5.34); however, the McGraw-Hill reading programs are reasonably close in cost with $6.94 per student per year. The Random House reading programs are the most expensive -- more than twice as costly ($11.94) as the D.C. Heath reading programs and about 68% more than the McGraw-Hill reading programs.

Table VI - 1

ANNUALIZED PER STUDENT COSTS FOR
COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP READING PROGRAMS

D.C. Heath	$ 5.34
McGraw-Hill	6.94
Random House	11.94

The standardized test results for the two year period (Table VI - 2) do not, at this point, show a clear pattern favoring one reading program over the other. In 1973-74, the McGraw-Hill reading programs achieved better results than the other two in grade 2 - 1.1 vs. 0.9 Reading Total Gain Score,

Table VI - 2

READING - RESULTS OF COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP STANDARDIZED TEST ANALYSIS FOR 1972-73 and 1973-74 BY GRADE

GRADE EQUIVALENT TOTAL SCORES

	1972-73 *			1973-74		
Reading CP Program	Grade 1**	Grade 2#	Grade 3#	Grade 1**	Grade 2##	Grade 3##
D .C. Heath	1.5	.9	.6	1.4	.9	.8
McGraw-Hill	1.9	.9	.4	1.4	1.1	.8
Random House	1.9	.8	.3	1.6	.9	.8

---

* Evaluation Report, ESEA Title I Program for 1972-1973 Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Vol. 1 Federal City College, Washington, D.C., Contract No. 73223, April 30, 1974.

** Grade 1 Posttest Grade Equivalent Total Scores.

# Total Gain Scores adjusted for differences in pretests.

## Total Gain Scores

Grade Equivalent; Random House reading programs achieved better results in grade 1 than the other two reading programs - 1.6 vs. 1.4 Reading Posttest Total Score, Grade Equivalent; but there was no difference among the programs in reading tests in grade 3. In 1972-73 the D.C. Heath reading programs compared with the others achieved the highest results in grade 3 (.6 Grade Equivalent Gain vs. .4 and .3) and the lowest results in grade 1 (1.5 Grade Equivalent Posttest vs. 1.9 for the others). The analyses of the subtests (Reading Comprehension and Vocabulary) show substantially the same pattern of results among the CP programs as does the analysis of the Total Reading Score.

Table VI -3 shows the summary profile of input and process variables for the CP reading programs. These data were obtained largely from the Teachers Questionnaire. Differences among the variables are examined in terms of circumstances that may qualify the results of the cost and standardized test analysis. Differences among the programs were tested, using standard statistical techniques (Chi Square) and were also examined for trends favoring one program over the other.

Notice first that the CP reading groups are about equal in terms of the qualifications and teaching experience of the teachers using them. Additionally, the CP reading groups are about equal in all but one area related to the library, its use, and reading activities. Finally, the groups are about the same in terms of whether or not the teachers were involved in making the decision about the selection of the CP reading program.

In almost all of the remaining areas, the Random House reading programs appear to have operated at a distinct disadvantage. The Random House

Table VI - 3

SUMMARY PROFILE OF COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP READING PROGRAMS

Area and Item	Difference *	Comments
Student/Teacher Ratio	None	
Students/Staff Member Trained in CP	D.C. - 21; M.H. - 10; R.H. - 11**	
Percentage Increase of Users over 1972-73	92% increase in number of teachers using R.H. over last year.	
Arrival/Starting Dates of CP Programs	D.C. - 80% arrived by Dec. (only 45% of others arrived by Dec.) R.H. - arrived late and started late.	All teachers had other curriculum materials in Sept.
Time Spent on Reading	R.H. - teachers spent 30% less time than M.H.; R.H. - teachers spent 40% less time than D.C.	
Teaching Activities	M.H. - emphasized listening & comprehension skills less but used written composition & dictation more.	
Teacher Aides	D.C. & M.H. teachers had aides more than R.H. teachers.	90% had aides assigned.
Time Basis	None	58% of teachers had aides less than 1/2 time 37% of teachers had aides half of the time
Related Reading Activities	R.H. teachers used Book Fair much less (27% as compared to almost 1/2 of others)	Read More In '74 used by almost 2/3 of all; RIF used by only about 10% of all; Bookmobile used by only about 25% of all.

Table VI - 3 (continued)

Area and Item	Difference*	Comments
Library and Reading Period		
Classroom Library	None	83% of all had them.
Well Equipped School Lib.	None	88% well equipped.
Silent Reading Period	None	77% provided one.
Take Home Books	None	Could not in 1/3 of instances.
Take Textbooks Home	None	69% of all did not allow.
Librarian	None	93% had full-time.
Other Library Visits	R.H. - less than 1/2 allowed other visits as compared to 2/3 of others	
Pupil Progress Profile Records	R.H. - kept loss. (19% did not as compared to 7-11% of others who did not)	
Individualization of Instruction	D.C. - more small groups, less large, less individualized.	82% of all used small groups, individualized, or both.
Selection of CP Program	None	Primarily done through collaboration of central school administrators & reading resource teachers; classroom teacher least frequently participates in decision making in selection of Title I materials.
Teacher Qualifications and Experience		
Level of Education	None	Average - B.A. for 75.3% of all.
Certification	None	65% permanent.
Pursuit of Other Certification	None	Only 20% seeking another type of certification. Where more permanent, less seeking another.
Yrs. Title I Teaching Experience	None	78% have 0-3 yrs. experience.
Yrs. teaching Primary	None	

Table VI - 3 (conclusion)

Area and Item	Difference*	Comments
Teacher Ratings of CP Programs	R.H. - M.H. - consistently higher.	Particularly in language activities, enrichment activities, & adjusted to individual needs.
	D.C. - consistently lower.	Sample of teachers was small.

---

* Differences among CP programs tested for statistical significance using the Chi Square test. Differences significant at the 5% level of confidence are reported.

** Abbreviations: D.C. = D.C. Heath
M.H. = McGraw-Hill
R.H. = Random House

reading program was started late in the school year in 1972-73. In 1973-74 many teachers were just starting with the Random House CP program (92% increase over 1972-73) and, in fact, more than half reported that they did not receive the books and materials until January 1974 or later. Furthermore, teachers using the Random House reading programs reported spending 30% less time on reading (minutes per week) than those teachers who used the McGraw-Hill programs and 40% less time on reading than those using the D.C. Heath programs. Teachers using the Random House programs also had teacher aides assigned to them less frequently. Finally, when teachers ratings of the reading programs are considered, both McGraw-Hill and Random House are rated higher than D.C. Heath. Given a full year of work with the Random House materials, gain scores might prove to be higher than those obtained for 1972-73 and 1973-74.

Differences between the D.C. Heath and the McGraw-Hill reading programs, in terms of the input, process, and product (test scores) used are negligible. The McGraw-Hill programs were rated higher than the D.C. Heath programs. However, the sample of teachers who rated each program was too small to make these results conclusive. The ratio of the number of students per staff member trained (in use of CP materials) in 1973-74 seems to give McGraw-Hill the advantage (McGraw-Hill, 10 students/staff member; D.C. Heath, 21 students per staff member); however, it is possible that D.C. Heath trained more staff members in the previous year.

RECOMMENDATIONS - READING COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS

Although the D.C. Heath reading programs are the least costly in terms of annualized per student cost, the information on effectiveness is not sufficiently clear-cut to favor one publisher's programs over the other.

An improved distribution and analytic model (detailed later in this report) should be implemented for the third year of the cost effectiveness analysis. In this model, samples of teachers and students are given a combination of two Competitive Partnership programs to use for the year, and the cost effectiveness of using the combinations of programs is analyzed. Comparisons of costs, teacher ratings, test results and other variables should be made. There are a number of reasons for this recommendation:

1. Use of several programs should enable teachers to select various Competitive Partnership reading materials, according to the learning needs and styles of individual children. Teachers should be able to capitalize on the strengths of various Competitive Partnership programs. This approach is more consistent with the concept of the Total Learning Center.
2. In 1973-74 about 15% of the teachers responding indicated that they were using more than one Competitive Partnership reading progam. Apparently, use of several programs was not planned by the Title I office, as the Competitive Partnership program user data listed only two teachers who were using several Competitive Partnership programs. It was not possible to analyze the test results for teachers using several Competitive Partnership programs; however,

their ratings of Competitive Partnership programs were quite favorable.

3. When a decision is reached regarding the most cost effective program(s), the materials from the other publishers (i.e., those on hand and paid for) will have to be distributed among the schools and teachers who will have the greatest use for them. The analysis of teachers and students using more than one program will provide data relevant to the redistribution of these materials.

SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS: COST EFFECTIVENESS OF THE COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP MATHEMATICS PROGRAMS

SUMMARY

The cost profile for mathematics is shown in Table VI - 4. D.C. Heath mathematics is clearly the least expensive of the three mathematics CP programs. In terms of annualized per student costs, D.C. Heath's cost compared to its nearest competitor (Random House) is slightly more than half ($3.06 vs. $5.64). Additionally, the test results for grades 2 and 3, for both 1972-73 and 1973-74 show that D.C. Heath was the most effective in terms of student Total Gain Score Grade Equivalents. The test results are summarized in Table VI - 5 for the two years.

It would be premature, however, to reject in their entirety the Random House mathematics and Addison-Wesley mathematics programs. Although Random House and Addison-Wesley are more costly, both programs resulted in quite acceptable gain scores in grades 2 and 3 and were actually superior to the D.C. Heath mathematics program in grade 1 in 1973-74 (grade 1 mathematics data was not reported in the 1972-73 study conducted by Federal City College).

Other factors also need to be considered. Table VI - 6 shows the summary profile of input and process variables for the CP mathematics programs. As with the CP reading analysis, differences in CP mathematics programs are examined in terms of circumstances that may qualify the cost or test data obtained.

The Addison-Wesley program was in its first year of operation in the CP and, as a consequence, teachers started late and materials arrived late. Although there were also late deliveries for D.C. Heath, there was

Table VI - 4

ANNUALIZED PER STUDENT COSTS FOR COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP MATHEMATICS PROGRAMS

Addison-Wesley	$5.89
D.C. Heath	3.06
Random House	5.64

Table VI - 5

MATHEMATICS - RESULTS OF COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP STANDARDIZED TEST ANALYSIS FOR 1972-73 and 1973-74 BY GRADE

GRADE EQUIVALENT TOTAL SCORES

	1972-73			1973-74		
Mathematics CP Program	Grade 1**	Grade 2#	Grade 3##	Grade 1**	Grade 2##	Grade 3##
D.C. Heath	No Data	1.0	.9	(1.4)	.9	1.1
Random House	No Data	.7	.6	1.5	.8	1.0
Addison-Wesley	Not Used			1.6	.8	1.0

---

*Evaluation Report, ESEA Title I Program for 1972-1973 Public Schools of the District of Columbia, Vol. 1. Federal City College, Washington, D.C., Contract No. 73223, April 30, 1974.

**Grade 1 - Posttest Grade Equivalent Total Scores.

#Total Gain Scores adjusted for differences in pretests.

##Total Gain Scores

Table VI -6

SUMMARY PROFILE OF COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP MATHEMATICS PROGRAMS

Area and Item	Difference*	Comments
Student/Teacher Ratio	R.H. - 22.2; A.W. - 20.8; D.C. - 19.8.	R.H. - larger classes than others.
Students/Staff Trained in CP	R.H. - 17; A.W.- 12; D.C.-11.	R.H. - More staff development indicated.
Percentage Increase of Users over 1972-73	A.W. - new to CP. R.H. - twice as many. D.C. - not much change.	
Starting Dates	A.W. started late, others on time.	
Arrival Dates	A.W. & D.C. arrived late. R.H. & C arrived by Dec.	
Teaching Activities	C use numeration more & emphasize operations more. R.H. uses operations less.	
Teacher Aides	98% R.H. have aides; 87-89% D.C. & A.W.; only 54% C have aides.	
Library and Equipment		
Classroom Equipment	A.W. & C well equipped in 92-93% cases compared to 71-78% of D.C. & R.H.	
Access to Manipulative Devices	None	94% of all had access.
Taking Textbooks Home	None	59% of all allowed students to do so.
Cultural Enrichment Field Trip	None	20% of all have done so; 25% of D.C.
Pupil Progress Profile Records	All C teachers have kept books on some or all of Title I students compared to 80-87% of others.	
Individualization of Instruction	C teachers use small groups more	Teachers using single CPs used small & large groupings in equal proportion.

Table VI - 6 (conclusion)

Area and Item	Difference*	Comments
Selection of CP Program	None	Collaboration of central & school administrators and math resource teachers.
Staff Qualifications & Experience		
Level of Education	None	78% of all had B.A. 14% C had M.A. or Ph.D. compared to 7% of others.
Certification	80% R.H. permanent compared to 63-68% of others.	
Seeking Other Certification	None	Only 20%
Yrs. Teaching Title I	More R.H. & C teachers have 2-3 yrs. experience	
Yrs. Teaching Primary	C teachers have less experience.	
Time Teaching Mathematics	None	
Teaching Ratings	D.C. lower than R.H. or A.W. C highest ratings - 100% in all but two categories.	D.C. lower than R.H. & A.W. in graphic layout, manipulative media; supplementary materials; enrichment activities. Small sample of teachers - results tentative.

---

* Differences among CP programs tested for statistical significance using the Chi Square test.

** Abbreviations:
A.W. = Addison-Wesley
D.C. = D.C. Heath
R.H. = Random House
C = Combined - users of more than one program.

probably enough material available from the previous year to compensate for the late deliveries. There was also a substantial increase from 1972-73 in the number of teachers using the Random House mathematics programs - about twice the number as in the previous year. Although materials arrived on time, start-up problems could have been encountered. Staff training needs for the Random house mathematics program users are suggested by the fact that the ratio of students to staff members trained was 17, compared with 11 and 12 for the other programs.

Other differences among the three CP mathematics programs seemed, by and large, to give no particular advantage to any of the three. These differences are summarized as follows:

1. Random House teachers have more experience than D.C. Heath or McGraw-Hill, have permanent certification more than all others, and have more experience in primary grades than all others.
2. Random House teachers use operations and measurement as teaching activities less than others.
3. Random House teachers have more aides than others.
4. Random House rated slightly better than Addison-Wesley overall, and much better in its testing materials.
5. Addison-Wesley teachers have better equipped classrooms than D.C. Heath and Random House.
6. Addison-Wesley was rated better than Random House.

It is unfortunate that the records provided by the Title I office did not indicate the teachers who were using combinations of several programs. It would have been useful to compare the results with those using only one program.

Data from the Teachers Questionnaire shows that 28 teachers or 5.8% of those responding who were in the Competitive Partnership program were using several programs, with 17 of the 28 using both D.C. Heath and Addison-Wesley; 6 using D.C. Heath and Random House; 4 using Addison-Wesley and Random House; and 1 using all three mathematics programs.

Although the sample is small, the results in Table VI - 6 show the following:

1. Combination teachers are more experienced in the Title I program.
2. Combination teachers use small groups more than others.
3. Combination teachers keep pupil profile records on some or all Title I students, more than others.
4. Combination teachers have better equipped classrooms than D. C. Heath and Random House, but not better equipped than Addison-Wesley.
5. Combination teachers have fewer aides but have them for longer periods of time.
6. Combination teachers use numeration and number theory as teaching activities more than others.
7. Combination program teachers started in fall, materials arrived by December, and they had access to last year's materials.
8. A combination of programs rated higher than single programs, 100% in all categories except testing and problem solving.

RECOMMENDATIONS - MATHEMATICS CP PROGRAMS

As with the Competitive Partnership reading programs, an improved distribution and analytic model should be implemented. In this model, samples of about 20-30 teachers/classrooms should be given combinations of two programs to use in order to test whether or not the strengths of one program compensate for weaknesses in another in terms of the learning needs and styles of the students.

ADDITIONAL RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING THE RECORD KEEPING AND COST EFFECTIVENESS ANALYSIS OF THE COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS

The following recommendations are applicable to both the reading and mathematics Competitive Partnership programs, and are recommended for implementation in 1974-75 operations and analysis.

1. Cost. Cost records should be analyzable by the grade-level for which the materials were purchased as well as by consummable and non-consummable materials. A grade-level breakdown would enable the costs to be properly allocated by grade, a part of the analysis that was not possible with the 1973-74 data. It seems unlikely that the percentage of costs among grades is distributed equally for each publisher. In all likelihood, some publishers supplied materials for kindergarten while others did not. However, there is not an associated standardized test of effectiveness for kindergarten with which to assess the outcome of these materials.

   In the 1974-75 analysis, cost data for all three years will be needed. Furthermore, since there is considerable carryover of instructional materials from earlier years, it will be necessary to cumulate costs for the three years to represent the value of instructional materials on hand, as well as to annualize the costs of the various programs.

2. Competitive Partnership program utilization records and student test records. The Competitive Partnership program(s) used should be entered on each student's record. The use of several programs should be recorded where appropriate. Data should be obtained

from both classroom and resource teachers, particularly since resource teachers may use program(s) different from those used by the classroom teacher. A measure of "degree of utilization" is needed for each student as well as for the class. For purposes of the evaluation, it is important to be able to match utilization records obtained from teachers with students' test data. For this purpose, teachers should be asked to give their name on the Teachers Questionnaire with the assurance that the data will be held in strict confidence and only for the purpose of the Competitive Partnership analysis.

3. Develop a more compehensive Competitive Partnership criterion rating form for use by teachers. Obtain data for single and multiple program users in order to obtain more sensitive comparisons of the strengths and weaknesses of various programs.
4. Contracts with the publishers should be signed as soon as possible and delivery of contracted program materials made as early as possible in the school year. Because of the lag time between contractual commitments, delivery of programs and their actual use and impact appropriate records should be maintained for each contractor as to the date of the contract and the period of the school year in which delivery was made and services provided.
5. Limit further contracts with the publishers (now represented in the Competitive Partnership) for instructional materials to the replacement of consummable materials required for the continuation of services and of the cost effectiveness analysis.

There should be an adequate supply of instructional materials on hand to serve 10,000 - 12,000 students. Continuation of Staff Development contracts are warranted where more staff need to be trained and to equalize the ratio of students to numbers of staff trained.

6. As indicated earlier, provide for meaningful opportunities for teachers to use several programs together in order to determine whether better results are obtained when more than one program is used with the students. In all probability, the strengths of one publisher's program will compensate for the weaknesses of another publisher's program. Samples of 20-30 teachers or classrooms should be large enough to test the efficacy of combined program usage.

COST ANALYSIS

CONTRACT COSTS

A cost effectiveness analysis is carried out in order to reach decisions among a number of alternatives, in this case the Competitive Partnership programs in reading and mathematics. Although a number of alternatives are being tried out, it is assumed that it will be possible to reach a decision among them which would eliminate the most costly and/or the least effective in the long run. In other words, the costs actually incurred must be projected into the future as repeatable costs, because it is these costs, not those already incurred, over which decision makers have control. To project future costs, actual expenditures for Competitive Partnership programs are annualized and converted to costs per student served, so that a fair comparison can be made among the various programs.

For the Competitive Partnership programs, the costs of the instructional materials and the costs of Staff Development must be taken into account.

Table VI - 7 shows the costs of the instructional materials in reading for each publisher for school year 1973-74 and the costs of staff development 1972-73 and 1973-74. Table VI - 8 shows similar costs for mathematics. These data were provided by the Title I office about April 1974 and were updated in August 1974 to take into account modifications in the contracts with the publishers. The instructional materials costs have been separated into categories of consummable and non-consummable costs, defined as follows:

1. Costs of Consummables - Costs of workbooks, tests and other materials that are used by the students themselves and have to be reordered frequently. In some cases, such as tests, answer sheets, workbooks, pamphlets, handouts, these materials may have to be reordered annually in order to maintain an adequate supply. Some schools like to give students workbooks, pamphlets and other items to keep as many Title I students often do not have books of their own at home. In other cases, some consummable materials may be used for two or three years by the schools. Workbooks and test booklets, for example, can be reused by the schools by having students write their answers on separate paper. Because some of these materials have to be replaced each year, and some materials can be reused for two or three years, the costs of consummable materials are di-

Table VI - 7

COST ANALYSIS OF THE COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS

READING PROGRAMS

1. Supplier-Contractor	2. Costs of Instruc. Materials - Total*	3. Costs of Consummable Instruc. Materials	4. Costs of Non-Consummable Instruc. Materials	5. Percent of Instruc. Mat. Non-Consummable
D.C. Heath	$ 66,177	$ 27,500	$ 38,677	58.4
McGraw-Hill	113,318	68,898	44,420	39.2
Random House	89,327	59,849	29,478	33.0
Total	$268,822	$156,247	$112,575	41.9

Supplier-Contractor	6. Costs of Staff Training **	7. Number of Staff & Parents Trained	8. Average Trainee Cost (Col. 6 ÷ Col. 7)	9. Total Program Costs (Col. 2 + Col. 6)
D.C. Heath	$18,500	200	$92.50	$ 84,677
McGraw-Hill	17,500***	635	27.56	130,818
Random House	16,612	300	55.37	105,939
Total	$52,612	1135	$46.35	$321,434

---

* 1973-74 only.
** Staff training includes 1972-73 and 1973-74.
*** Gratuity from company of $9000.

Table VI - 8

COST ANALYSIS OF THE COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAMS

MATHEMATICS PROGRAMS

1. Supplier-Contractor	2. Costs of Instruc. Materials - Total*	3. Costs of Consummable Instruc. Materials	4. Costs of Non-Consummable Instruc. Materials	5. Percent of Instruc. Mat. Non-Consummable
D.C. Heath	$ 24,078	$16,854	$ 7,224	30.0
Random House	52,747	36,923	15,824	30.0
Addison-Wesley	85,809	25,782	60,027	70.0
Total	$162,634	$79,559	$83,075	51.1

Supplier-Contractor	6. Costs of Staff Training**	7. Number of Staff & Parents Trained	8. Average Trainee Cost (Col. 6 ÷ Col. 7)	9. Total Program Costs (Col. 2 + Col. 6)
D.C. Heath	$ 38,500	500	$77.00	$ 62,578
Random House	22,442	275	81.61	75,189
Addison-Wesley	20,000	357	56.02	105,809
Total	$ 80,942	1132	$71.50	$243,576

---

* 1973-74 only.

** Staff training includes 1972-73 and 1973-74.

vided by two years to represent the annualized costs. These are the costs required to replace used up materials each year.

2. Costs of Non-consummables - Costs of teachers' books and manuals, maps, charts, hardbound books and the like which are likely to be reused for an extended number of years. These are materials that do not wear out easily and/or are not distributed to students. However, sooner or later, these materials will require replacement because the content or presentation may become out-of-date or they are no longer useable for effective teaching. Although some materials can be used for longer periods than other materials, costs of non-consummable materials are divided by seven years to represent the annualized costs.

The cost information in Table VI - 7 shows that in 1973-74 the largest contract for reading materials was with the McGraw-Hill Publishing Company ($113,318), while the smallest contract for reading materials was with D.C. Heath. D.C. Heath also had the largest percentage of non-consummable materials, with 58.4% compared with 39.2% and 33.0% for the other two publishers.

In mathematics in 1973-74 (Table VI-8) the largest contract for instructional materials was with Addison-Wesley and the smallest contract was with D.C. Heath. In this case, Addison-Wesley had the largest percentage of non-consummable materials, with 70.0% compared with 30.0% for each of the other two publishers.

The instructional materials costs presented in Tables VI - 1 and VI - 2 do not reflect the total amount spent under the Competitive Partnership programs with each publisher, as only 1973-74 costs are included. Costs for 1972-73 must be added to reflect the total amount spent for instructional materials with each publisher under the Competitive Partnership program. It is our understanding that the three-year cost effectiveness analysis to be conducted in 1974-75 will include the 1972-73 cost data for instructional materials.

The staff development costs, as mentioned earlier, include 1972-73 and 1973-74 contracts with the publishers. Actually, staff development contracts for 1972-73 were signed quite late in that school year (starting in April 1973). Therefore, for all practical purposes, the impact of the 1972-73 staff development contracts would be felt in 1973-74. In reading (Table VI - 1), the largest contracts for staff development were with D.C. Heath and the smallest with Random House. In mathematics (Table VI-2), the largest contracts for staff development were with D.C. Heath and the smallest with Addison-Wesley.

In the staff development costs for reading, it should be noted that McGraw-Hill contributed services valued at $9,000 at no charge to PSDC. Furthermore, Title I personnel reported that Random House consultants also contributed time at no charge to PSDC; however, the dollar value of that contribution was not known.

In all, $565,000 was spent for Competitive Partnership instructional materials for 1973-74 and staff development for 1972-73 and 1973-74.

ANNUALIZED COSTS AND PER STUDENT COSTS

Tables VI - 9 and VI - 10 show the annualized costs and the per student costs of instructional materials and of staff development for reading and mathematics.

As indicated earlier, annualized costs for consummables assume that consummables can be used for two years, and annualized costs for non-consummables assume that these materials can be used for an average of seven years.

Finally, staff development costs are also annualized. The cost of training that an individual staff member receives is not a repeatable cost. Such training is useful to Title I as long as that staff member continues to work with Title I children. After the first three years, the number of new staff requiring training should be sharply reduced. Ideally, a staff training build-up schedule would provide the detailed data needed, including the cumulative number of staff members trained; the number requiring training to serve the target population of students; average expected years of continuing service with Title I (based on turnover rate); and provision for training of staff replacements. Since this detailed data is not available, it is assumed that the staff training provided for the first two years will serve for an average of 5 years. Thus, Staff Development costs are annualized by dividing by five.

The number of students served was obtained from the Building Profiles provided by the Title I office in April 1974 and updated about August 1974 to reflect modifications in the contracts with the various publishers. The per student costs in column 9 in Tables VI - 9 and VI - 10 differ from those in column 6 in that those in column 9 include staff development costs.

The results show that the D.C. Heath reading program is the least costly, followed by McGraw-Hill and Random House. The Random House reading program is more than twice as expensive as the D.C. Heath program on a per student cost basis. The difference between the McGraw-Hill Reading program and the D.C. Heath reading program is much less ($6.94 vs. $5.34) when measured on a per student cost basis, a difference of $1.60 per year, or about 30% more for McGraw-Hill than for D.C. Heath.

Table VI-10 shows the results of the per student costs for mathematics programs. D.C. Heath is the least expensive of the mathematics programs, while D.C. Heath and Addison-Wesley have quite similar per student costs. However, Random House and Addison-Wesley mathematics programs are about 90% more expensive than the D.C. Heath mathematics program.

LIMITATIONS IN THE COST ANALYSIS DATA

As indicated earlier, the costs presented here for instructional materials are only for 1973-74. If one or more of the programs had a significant amount of materials carried over from purchases made in 1972-73, these costs would not be included in this analysis and might make it appear that one program is less expensive when in fact the costs were simply incurred in a previous accounting period. Allowances for such an event will have to be made in the three year CP cost effectiveness analysis planned for the 1974-75 evaluation.

Table VI - 9

ANNUALIZED COSTS AND PER STUDENT COSTS - READING

1. Supplier-Contractor	2. Instruc. Materials Annualized Costs Consummables*	3. Instruc. Materials Annualized Costs Non-Consummables**	4. Annualized Costs Instruc. Materials (Col. 2 + Col. 3)	5. Students Served***
D.C. Heath	$13,250	$ 5,525	$ 18,775	4208
McGraw-Hill	34,449	6,346	40,795	6378
Random House	29,925	4,211	34,136	3216

Supplier-Contractor	6. Per Student Costs Instruc. Mats. (Col. 4 ÷ Col. 5)	7. Annualized Costs Staff Development****	8. Total Annualized Costs (Col. 4 + Col. 7)	9. Per Student Costs (Col. 8 ÷ Col. 5)
D.C. Heath	$ 4.46	$ 3,700	$ 22,475	$ 5.34
McGraw-Hill	6.39	3,500	44,295	6.94
Random House	10.61	3,322	37,458	11.64

---

* Useful for two years.

** Useful for seven years.

*** Based on Building Profiles provided by the Title I office.

**** Useful for five years.

Table VI - 10

ANNUALIZED COSTS AND PER STUDENT COSTS - MATHEMATICS

1. Supplier-Contractor	2. Instruc. Materials Annualized Costs Consummables*	3. Instruc. Materials Annualized Costs Non-Consummables**	4. Annualized Costs Instruc. Materials (Col. 2 + Col. 3)	5. Students Served***
D.C. Heath	$ 8,427	$ 1,032	$ 9,459	5569
Random House	18,462	2,261	20,723	4463
Addison-Wesley	12,891	8,575	21,466	4319

Supplier-Contractor	6. Per Student Costs Instruc. Mats. (Col. 4 ÷ Col. 5)	7. Annualized Costs Staff Development****	8. Total Annualized Costs (Col. 4 + Col. 7)	9. Per Student Costs (Col. 8 ÷ Col. 5)
D.C. Heath	$1.68	$ 7,700	$17,159	$3.06
Random House	4.64	4,488	25,211	5.64
Addison-Wesley	4.97	4,000	25,466	5.89

---

* Useful for two years.
** Useful for seven years.
*** Based on Building Profiles provided by the Title I office.
**** Useful for five years.

ANALYSIS OF STANDARDIZED TEST RESULTS BY COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The standardized tests administered by the school system were analyzed according to the type of competitive partnership program used by the teachers and students in reading and mathematics. The results of these analyses are summarized in Tables VI - 11 and VI - 12. These results show that in reading the best results for grade 1 were achieved by those teachers and students using the Random House programs. There was no significant difference in reading gain scores among the CP program users in grade 3. Generally, in grades 1 and 2, the results achieved by teachers and students using the D.C. Heath reading programs were slightly lower than the results for all Title I students.

In mathematics (Table VI - 12) the best results were achieved by teachers and students in grades 2 and 3 using the D.C. Heath mathematics programs, and in grade 1 the Addison -Wesley programs.

Tables VI-14 through VI-19 present the detailed data for the standardized tests.

DETAILS OF ANALYSIS, PROCEDURES, AND RESULTS

Procedures

The comparative analysis of standardized test data by Competitive Partnership programs was carried out using the samples of public school Title I identified students in grades 1, 2 and 3 for whom there were matched pretest and posttest records. As indicated elsewhere in this report (Chapter II, Public School Standardized Test Results), there was no Title I indicator on the computer tape of standardized test results. For purposes of the test score analysis, Title I students were designated as those students scoring at the 50th percentile or below (or its equivalent) on the pretest. Pretests and

Table VI - 11

SUMMARY OF COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP ANALYSIS OF READING TEST RESULTS BY GRADE
(Also Comparison to Gains of All Students)

Competitive Partnership Program	GRADE 1* Posttest G.E. Total	GRADE 1* Posttest G.E. Comprehension	GRADE 1* Posttest G.E. Voc.	GRADE 2 Gain G.E. Total	GRADE 2 Gain G.E. Comprehension	GRADE 2 Gain G.E. Voc.	GRADE 3 Gain G.E. Total	GRADE 3 Gain G.E. Comprehension	GRADE 3 Gain G.E. Voc.
D.C. Heath	1.4	(1.6)	1.5	.9	(.6)	.9	.8	.8	.8
McGraw-Hill	1.4	1.8	1.5	1.1	BEST .8	1.1	.8	.8	.9
Random House	1.6	BEST 2.0	1.6	.9	.7	.9	.8	.8	.9
All Students	1.5	1.8	1.5	1.0	.8	1.0	.8	.8	.9

* In grade 1, there were no significant differences among the CP groups in the readiness of the students as measured by the Metropolitan Readiness Test.

Table VI - 12

SUMMARY OF COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP ANALYSIS OF MATHEMATICS TEST RESULTS BY GRADE

Competitive Partnership Program	GRADE								
	1			2			3		
	Posttest G.E.			Gain G.E.			Gain G.E.		
	Total	Computation	Concepts	Total	Computation	Concepts	Total	Computation	Concepts
		BEST							
Addison-Wesley	1.6	1.5	1.9	.8	.8	1.0	1.0	1.0	.8
		Higher than all						Lower	
					BEST			BEST	
D.C. Heath	(1.4)	(1.3)	1.7	.9	.8	1.2	1.1	1.2	.9
		Lower			About equal to all			About equal	
Random House	1.5	1.4	1.7	.8	.8	.9	1.0	1.1	.9
All Students	1.5	1.4	1.7	.9	.8	1.1	1.1	1.1	.9

posttests were matched by student identification number in order to calculate gain scores and distinguish between the results of Title I and non-Title I students. A matching of pretest and posttest records was achieved for about 50% of the grade 1 students and about 60% of the grades 2 and 3 students.

For the comparisons among the Competitive Partnership programs, it was then necessary to match the CP program used by the teachers and students with the test data. The source of data indicating the CP program used was the "Building Profile" provided by the Title I office. These profiles were provided about April 1974 and subsequently updated to take account of changes in the assignment of CP programs to specific schools and teachers. This list was considered to be the most complete and authoritative source available.

Matching CP program with student test data was carried out as follows:

1. Schools in which only one CP program was used and non-CP schools. In those cases in which the school was not participating in the CP program and when all teachers of Title I students in the school were using the same CP program in reading or in mathematics, the appropriate CP code number was assigned to all Title I students in the school.
2. Schools in which different teachers and students were using different CP programs. To match the CP program used with student test data required printing out a list of teachers' names with their corresponding "group code number." This code group number identified the students for each teacher. Next, the teachers' names and CP program used (based on the "Building Profile" data supplied by the Title I office) were matched with the teachers'

> names on the computer printout. Matching of teachers' names from the two records was used only as a means of identifying the CP program used with the students' test records. Only classroom teachers were used in the matching process. Data for Resource Teachers was not available.

Table VI-13 shows the results of the matching process for reading and mathematics in terms of the number of teachers using each CP program, those for whom there was no record, and multiple program users. Only 8 of the reading CP and 3 of the mathematics CP teacher records were not matched. Only one multiple CP reading program user was recorded and only 5 multiple CP mathematics program users were recorded.

Table VI - 13

COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP SAMPLE DATA FOR READING AND MATHEMATICS
NUMBER OF TEACHERS MATCHED FROM BUILDING PROFILES AND STANDARDIZED TEST RECORDS

	READING			MATHEMATICS		
CP Programs Other Category	Total Number of Teachers	Teachers in Schools Using One Program	Teachers in Schools Using More Than One CP Program	Total Number of Teachers	Teachers in Schools Using One Program	Teachers in Schools Using More Than One CP Program
Non CP	175	175	0	155	129	26
Addison-Wesley	Mathematics Only			208	0	208
D.C. Heath	205	112	93	281	117	164
McGraw-Hill	306	142	164	Reading Only		
Random House	159	66	93	201	131	70
D.C. Heath & McGraw-Hill	1	0	1	0	0	0
Addison-Wesley & D.C. Heath	0	0	0	3	0	3
Addison-Wesley & Random House	0	0	0	2	0	2
No Record Match	8	0	8	3	0	3
TOTAL	854	495	359	853	377	476

The sample of students for each CP program is more than adequate in size to obtain reliable results. However, improvements in sample size could be achieved by recording on the computer tape of test data the type of CP program used and a Title I student indicator.

In analyzing the results of the test scores, the data for students who were not in the Competitive Partnership program were treated as a separate group. Additionally, those students for whom it was not possible to identify an appropriate CP program (because of an inability to match the teacher's name on the computer printout with a name on the Building Profile) were treated as a separate group. The results of these two groups are included in the results for "all students" shown at the bottom of Tables VI - 11 and VI - 12. These groups are not considered appropriate control groups against which to compare results for the Competitive Partnership programs. The non-Competitive Partnership schools include schools in which the staff considered their programs of instruction to be adequate. Additionally, many non-CP schools were "new" to Title I. "New" schools often represent those with the lowest need in terms of the school eligibility criteria. Therefore, it seems appropriate to assume that these programs are often at least as adequate as those participating in the CP programs.

Analysis and Results

Tables VI - 14 through VI - 19 show the details of the analysis of the standardized tests by the Competitive Partnership programs in Reading and Mathematics. These tables contain the basic data from which Tables VI - 11 and VI - 12 were derived. Each table contains means, standard deviations, and N by grade, CP programs, and pretest, posttest and gain scores (except for grade 1).

Means and standard deviations are presented with two decimal positions. The results are also presented separately for all students (All Groups) in the grade, students who were not in the CP program (Non-Competitive) and students for whom it was not possible to identify the appropriate CP program (Unmatched).

The results of the Analysis of Variance (F test) are also shown. Differences significant at the .05 level of confidence or higher are indicated. A separate Analysis of Variance was carried out for each and every comparison separately for reading and mathematics tests and also for each grade, separately for pretest, posttest and gain scores.

(The Anova tests, however, included only the CP program subgroups and the Comparison Groups. It did not include the "All Groups" data, which is the sum of the others.)

Comparisons among pairs of means were carried out using the formula given by Walker and Lev for testing the significance of differences of means for a finite population when the sample size is large compared with the population itself. This formula is also useful considering the fact that the samples for each program are quite large. In that respect, it is more appropriate than other formulae for Students' "t" test, or other z tests. The formula is:

$$z = \frac{\overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2}{s\sqrt{1 - \frac{N}{M}}}$$

Where

$\overline{X}_1$ is the larger of the two means;

$\overline{X}_2$ is the smaller of the two means;

s is the sample standard deviation of the two groups combined;

N/M is the proportion of cases in the sample.

Using this formula, a check was made for significance of differences of means by solving for $d = \overline{X}_1 - \overline{X}_2$, at the .05 level of confidence or higher. The tables show partial results of this analysis. Not all comparisons were carried out as they did not necessarily seem meaningful. Inspection of the data suggested that rounding errors and small differences in sample sizes (e.g., among the pretests, posttests and gain scores for the same set of data) may in some cases have led to obtaining statistically significant but substantively unimportant differences. Therefore, in preparing the Summary Tables (Tables VI - 11 and VI - 12) the following factors were considered:

1. Was there a significant difference in the F test?
2. Was there a significant difference in the z test?

3. Was there a difference between means of CP groups of at least one-half month in terms of grade equivalents, after allowing for rounding errors and differences in sample size?
4. Was there a difference in the mean of a CP group with one of the comparison groups, of at least one-half month grade equivalent, after allowing for rounding errors and differences in sample size?
5. When gains are rounded to one decimal place, was there a difference of one or more months in grade equivalents among the CP programs?

The overall trends, based on the actual data and the factors listed above contributed to the presentation of findings in the summary tables (VI-2, VI-4, VI-11, and VI-12). The results are described earlier in this section. The detailed tables presented here are for those readers interested in the detailed statistical tables.

Table VI - 14

READING COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP ANALYSIS - GRADE 1
TEST ANALYSIS; METROPOLITAN READINESS TEST RAW SCORES AND READING GRADE EQUIVALENT POSTTEST SCORES

CP Program and Comparison Groups	Metropolitan Readiness Test Total Raw Score Mean	S.D.	N	Reading Posttest Total Grade Equivalent Mean	S.D.	N
All Groups	40.2	11.0	1585	1.45	.80	1433
Non CP	40.4	10.8	318	1.35	.84	299
D.C. Heath	40.0	10.9	366	1.45	.71	329
McGraw-Hill	40.0	11.3	514	1.45	.83	474
Random House	41.0	10.5	329	1.60	.85	279
Unmatched	39.5	12.0	58	1.36	.61	52
F Test; (df); significance	0.6651; (4/1580); No			3.644; (4/1428); .01		
				Vocabulary Grade Equivalent		
All Groups	-------	-------	-------	1.49	.81	1577
Non CP	-------	-------	-------	1.39	.83	319
D.C. Heath	-------	-------	-------	1.48	.70	369
McGraw-Hill	-------	-------	-------	1.50	.85	508
Random House	-------	-------	-------	1.60	.86	325
Unmatched	-------	-------	-------	1.45	.64	56
F Test; (df); significance	-------	-------	-------	2.561; (4/1572); .05		
				Comprehension Grade Equivalent		
All Groups	-------	-------	-------	1.75	.86	1436
Non CP	-------	-------	-------	1.74	.90	300
D.C. Heath	-------	-------	-------	1.64	.83	330
McGraw-Hill	-------	-------	-------	1.75	.83	474
Random House	-------	-------	-------	1.95	.90	280
Unmatched	-------	-------	-------	1.50	.62	52
F Test; (df); significance	-------	-------	-------	6.0625; (4/1431); .001		

Table VI - 15

COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP ANALYSIS - GRADE EQUIVALENT READING SCORES FOR GRADE 2

Test Score	CP Program and Comparison Groups	Pretest			Posttest			Gain		
		Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
Total	All Groups	1.42	.61	2747	2.43	.93	2738	1.00	.73	2612
	Non CP	1.44	.62	427	2.56	.88	435	1.10	.68	405
	D.C. Heath	1.42	.59	660	2.31	.81	644	.88	.56	622
	McGraw-Hill	1.46	.62	943	2.52	.96	939	1.04	.76	902
	Random House	1.41	.60	544	2.27	.86	552	.89	.63	518
	Unmatched	1.28	.58	167	2.63	1.30	163	1.34	1.23	160
	F Test; (df); significance	3.245; (5/2741); .01			11.494; (5/2732); .001			15.549; (5/2606); .001		
Vocabulary	All Groups	1.51	.62	2813	2.52	.99	2777	1.01	.77	2710
	Non CP	1.52	.62	444	2.64	.98	441	1.11	.74	428
	D.C. Heath	1.50	.60	666	2.41	.88	653	.90	.61	633
	McGraw-Hill	1.55	.64	960	2.63	1.06	955	1.07	.83	934
	Random House	1.49	.61	567	2.37	.92	554	.88	.67	543
	Unmatched	1.42	.59	170	2.62	1.18	167	1.19	1.09	166
	F Test; (df); significance	2.593; (5/2807); .05			10.572; (5/2771); .001			11.187; (5/2704); .001		
Comprehension	All Groups	1.50	.66	2757	2.29	1.07	2747	.79	1.13	2630
	Non CP	1.58	.70	433	2.48	1.00	435	.86	1.08	411
	D.C. Heath	1.51	.64	661	2.14	.93	647	.63	.98	626
	McGraw-Hill	1.52	.65	945	2.36	1.08	942	.82	1.13	907
	Random House	1.46	.65	545	2.13	.96	555	.69	1.07	521
	Unmatched	1.24	.63	167	2.61	1.69	163	1.37	1.67	160
	F Test; (df); significance	7.568; (5/2751); .001			13.044; (5/2741); .001			13.261; (5/2624); .001		

Table VI - 16

COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP ANALYSIS - GRADE EQUIVALENT READING SCORES FOR GRADE 3

		Pretest			Posttest			Gain		
Test Score	CP Program and Comparison Groups	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
Total	All Groups	2.30	.77	3020	3.08	1.03	3004	.79	.94	2888
	Non CP	2.32	.80	596	3.18	1.07	605	.86	.94	576
	D.C. Heath	2.23	.74	776	2.99	.97	767	.77	.90	746
	McGraw-Hill	2.30	.76	936	3.08	1.07	935	.77	1.01	891
	Random House	2.32	.77	522	3.10	1.02	513	.78	.91	498
	Unmatched	2.36	.76	190	3.07	.98	184	.72	.85	177
	F Test; (df); significance	2.277; (4/3015); No			2.748; (4/2999); .05			1.246; (4/2883); No		
Vocabulary	All Groups	2.12	.87	3043	2.95	1.19	3025	.83	1.14	2927
	Non CP	2.13	.90	607	3.01	1.22	609	.88	1.13	589
	D.C. Heath	2.04	.84	781	2.83	1.15	770	.78	1.14	752
	McGraw-Hill	2.12	.88	940	2.97	1.22	942	.85	1.19	902
	Random House	2.18	.85	525	3.03	1.15	516	.85	1.12	503
	Unmatched	2.23	.84	190	2.98	1.10	188	.76	.99	181
	F Test; (df); significance	3.084; (4/3038); 05			3.091; (4/3020); .05			0.828; (4/2922); No		
Comprehension	All Groups	2.28	.84	3029	3.10	1.17	3016	.81	1.11	2909
	Non CP	2.34	.86	597	3.30	1.22	606	.92	1.12	578
	D.C. Heath	2.23	.83	777	3.01	1.10	769	.78	1.03	749
	McGraw-Hill	2.30	.82	941	3.10	1.21	941	.80	1.20	902
	Random House	2.28	.84	524	3.10	1.20	516	.78	1.10	503
	Unmatched	2.27	.85	190	3.04	1.10	184	.77	1.10	177
	F Test; (df); significance	1.617; (4/3024); No			3.781; (4/3011); 01			1.672; (4/2904); No		

Table VI - 17

-----------------------MATHEMATICS COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP ANALYSIS - GRADE 1------------------------
TEST ANALYSIS; METROPOLITAN READINESS TEST RAW SCORES AND MATHEMATICS GRADE EQUIVALENT POSTTEST SCORES

CP Program and Comparison Groups	Metropolitan Readiness Test ------Total Raw Score------			Mathematics Posttest Total Grade Equivalent		
	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
All Groups	40.2	11.0	[illegible]	1.51	.71	1490
Non CP	40.3	11.0	289	1.41	.69	271
D.C. Heath	40.4	11.0	340	1.65	.70	311
McGraw-Hill	40.4	11.0	457	1.45	73	442
Random House	39.9	10.9	439	1.54	.70	410
Unmatched	39.8	11.9	60	1.44	.68	56
F Test; (df); significance	0.189; (4/1580); No			5.819; (4/1485); .001		
				Concepts Grade Equivalent		
All Groups	-------------------------------------			1.74	.89	1557
Non CP	-------------------------------------			1.65	.89	278
D.C. Heath	-------------------------------------			1.89	.92	337
McGraw-Hill	-------------------------------------			1.73	.92	457
Random House	-------------------------------------			1.73	.83	428
Unmatched	-------------------------------------			1.45	.72	57
F Test; (df); significance	-------------------------------------			4.518; (4/1552); .001		
				Computation Grade Equivalent		
All Groups	-------------------------------------			1.36	.71	1490
Non CP	-------------------------------------			1.27	.67	271
D.C. Heath	-------------------------------------			1.47	.71	311
McGraw-Hill	-------------------------------------			1.28	.71	442
Random House	-------------------------------------			1.41	.73	410
Unmatched	-------------------------------------			1.46	.74	56
F Test; (df); significance	-------------------------------------			5.085; (4/1485); .001		

Table VI - 18

COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP ANALYSIS - GRADE EQUIVALENT MATHEMATICS SCORES FOR GRADE 2

Test Score	CP Program and Comparison Groups	Pretest			Posttest			Gain		
		Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
Total	All Groups	1.55	.57	2772	2.43	.76	2765	.87	.60	2658
	Non CP	1.63	.58	391	2.51	.75	387	.87	.59	374
	D.C. Heath	1.57	.56	599	2.40	.72	613	.82	.58	582
	McGraw-Hill	1.55	.57	953	2.50	.78	950	.94	.64	916
	Random House	1.51	.59	678	2.33	.75	664	.81	.56	644
	Unmatched	1.46	.58	151	2.41	.83	151	.95	.64	142
	F Test; (df); significance	3.695; (4/2767); 01			6.254; (4/2760); 001			5.884; (4/2653); 001		
Concepts	All Groups	1.68	.69	2792	2.76	1.08	2786	1.07	.91	2694
	Non CP	1.74	.69	392	2.80	1.06	388	1.04	.83	376
	D.C. Heath	1.71	.70	607	2.76	1.02	618	1.03	.86	594
	McGraw-Hill	1.67	.67	958	2.85	1.14	959	1.19	.98	928
	Random House	1.64	.69	680	2.59	1.04	669	.94	.81	649
	Unmatched	1.62	.70	155	2.78	1.15	152	1.16	1.04	147
	F Test; (df); significance	1.949; (4/2787); No			5.923; (4/2781); 001			8.141; (4/2689); .001		
Computation	All Groups	1.46	.61	2774	2.27	.78	2765	.80	.70	2660
	Non CP	1.55	.63	392	2.38	.76	387	.82	.72	375
	D.C. Heath	1.46	.61	599	2.21	.76	613	.75	.69	582
	McGraw-Hill	1.47	.60	953	2.32	.78	950	.84	.72	916
	Random House	1.42	.62	679	2.19	.78	664	.77	.67	645
	Unmatched	1.33	.59	151	2.20	.81	151	.89	.68	142
	F Test; (df); significance	4.507; (4/2769); 01			5.707; (4/2760); 001			2.650; (4/2655); .05		

Table VI - 19

COMPETITIVE PARTNERSHIP ANALYSIS - GRADE EQUIVALENT MATHEMATICS SCORES FOR GRADE 3

Test Score	CP Program and Comparison Groups	Pretest			Posttest			Gain		
		Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N	Mean	S.D.	N
Total	All Groups	2.45	.65	2854	3.48	.82	2865	1.02	.80	2619
	Non CP	2.44	.67	532	3.42	.78	531	.96	.74	504
	D.C. Heath	2.45	.65	838	3.46	.81	844	.99	.77	767
	McGraw-Hill	2.45	.67	598	3.56	.87	580	1.09	.83	543
	Random House	2.43.	.63	643	3.45	.84	680	1.01	.83	595
	Unmatched	2.50	.61	243	3.60	.81	230	1.08	.78	210
	F Test; (df); significance	0.577; (4/2849); No			3.877; (4/2860); .01			2.464; (4/2614); .05		
Concepts	All Groups	2.34	.93	2969	3.20	1.19	2961	.86	1.20	2800
	Non CP	2.34	.95	544	3.13	1.13	541	.78	1.14	524
	D.C. Heath	2.37	.94	878	3.17	1.20	879	.80	1.23	831
	McGraw-Hill	2.28	.92	620	3.22	1.19	602	.91	1.16	584
	Random House	2.32	.92	667	3.18	1.25	596	.87	1.25	628
	Unmatched	2.41	.93	260	3.43	1.12	243	1.07	1.18	233
	F Test; (df); significance	1.314; (4/2964); No			3.093; (4/2956); .05			3.216; (4/2795); .05		
Computation	All Groups	2.55	.68	3065	3.62	.86	3048	1.07	.91	2974
	Non CP	2.51	.69	556	3.56	.81	554	1.04	.84	548
	D.C. Heath	2.57	.68	903	3.59	.85	905	1.03	.86	879
	McGraw-Hill	2.57	.70	626	3.74	.93	622	1.15	.99	609
	Random House	2.51	.67	716	3.58	.83	705	1.07	.94	683
	Unmatched	2.58	.63	264	3.72	.85	262	1.13	.91	255
	F Test; (df); significance	1.467; (4/3060); No			5.451; (4/3043); .001			2.138; (4/2969); No		

CHAPTER VII

PROGRAMS IN THE SPECIAL EDUCATION LEARNING CENTERS

The Special Education Learning Centers (SELC's) represent an application of the Total Learning Center concept to handicapped children who need special -- and intensive -- educational services in order to realize their learning potential. In addition, the SELC's **were** also a translation of the intent expressed in Mills v. The Board of Education to provide needed services to handicapped children without isolating them from their age-peer groups. As stated in the program materials provided to the evaluation team the SELC's **were** designed to accomplish four major objectives: (1) to enable participating children to escape the stigma associated with traditional special education labels; (2) to provide individualized educational services to each child according to his needs on a half-day basis; (3) to return each child to the regular classroom setting as soon as the child can manage it on a full-time basis; and (4) to provide assistance as needed to the child and his regular classroom teacher while he is in the SELC and after he returns to the regular classroom. The Special Education Learning Center, as defined for the purposes of this evaluation, enables handicapped children to escape obsolete special education programs which label them but do not either specify their deficiencies nor lead them to fulfilling their academic and social capabilities. The special education component as it operates within the Learning Center insures educational opportunity on an equal basis regardless of physical, psychological, sociological or intellectual impediments. The main objective of the program, as stated earlier, **was** the return of the child to the mainstream of education on a full-time basis within as limited a time as possible.

At present there are five Special Education Learning Centers sponsored by the Title I program. Table VII-1 shows them with the feeder schools which send children to each one of them.

TABLE VII-1

SPECIAL EDUCATION LEARNING CENTERS AND FEEDER SCHOOLS

Centers	Feeder Schools
Seaton	Simmons, Hanson, Garrison
Aiton	Richardson
Lewis	Mott
Watkins	Tyler
McGogney	Draper

Program Description

The fall 1973 Title I Special Education Learning Center's Program incorporated a team approach to help children learn more effectively by involving Learning Center consultants and those directly responsible for the child -the parents, the teachers and the child himself. The effect of the overall approach was to provide exceptional children with a program geared to their individual needs while allowing them to attend neighborhood schools and remain in regular classrooms, thereby eliminating the stigma of separation.

Each school housed a center composed of three learning settings. The three settings each served a specific function. One setting concentrated on mathematics, another on language and a third on perception.

Students had access to the services of all special teachers serving the building as well as such itinerant personnel as vision, hearing and speech specialists.

The ultimate aim of the Centers was to return students to a regular classroom setting as soon as possible. In the interim, arrangements were made for participation of students in regular school activities for a part of each day.

As the classroom teacher was responsible for the education of any child enrolled in the Center, she was kept aware of the diagnosis and the prescribed course of action, thereby enabling her to apply the techniques which were within her ability. To create and maintain this awareness of the classroom teacher, the Center teacher did the following things:

1. Provided the classroom teacher with relevant information about the child.

2. Provided the classroom teacher with specialized techniques and materials for use in the classroom.

3. Provided opportunities for the classroom teacher to visit and observe the techniques and materials in use and to confer with the Center teacher relative to educational program.

Initial enrollment of children in the Special Education Program was through the regular special educational referral procedure. However, the acceptance of children in the program involved a "non-categorical" assessment of learning disabilities. This permitted the regular classroom teacher and the special resource teachers to collabcrate on specific aims for working with each child. As progress was noted in the child, they were able to re-engage in regular classroom work with a minimum of disruption to established relationships.

Children were heterogeneously grouped regardless of type of handicap classification but homogeneously grouped according to social and academic ability.

Total enrollment varied throughout the year. New children entered the program as vacancies occurred due to children moving, receiving other placement or returning to the regular classroom.

Staffing Pattern

Each Learning Center within a cluster was served by three teachers and three teacher aides. The Centers received additional services from an instructional coordinator assigned to the project, the project psychologist and the project director.

All teachers were certified by the Board of Education and recruited through the Personnel Department of the D. C. Public Schools. The majority of the teachers had previous experiences in a Special Education Program, and were selected on the basis of their ability to contribute to the program's success.

The breakdown of staff and their responsibilities is given below:

(1) Program Director: Responsible for overall coordination and supervision.

(2) Resource Teacher: Responsible for ordering and gathering of materials. Collection and recording of data for central files. In-service training on the use of materials and assisting with the development of an individualized curriculum for each child.

(3) Psychologist: Responsible for the selection and development of materials to assist teachers with on-going assessment of children. Assisting teachers with development of behavioral objectives and placement of children in appropriate settings. Evaluation of test data.

(4) Teachers: Language and Mathematics (5 each). Responsible for diagnosing and planning an individualized program for each child in his subject, utilizing a variety of learning centers, in which the child

is placed according to his specific needs. Perception (5). Responsible for diagnosing and planning a program for each child to increase skills in motor, visual and auditory perception.

(5) Educational Assistants (15): Responsible for providing supportive services for the teacher, such as duplicating and preparing materials, helping keep records and conducting assigned teaching activities with individual students.

The three teachers in each Center were competent and knowledgeable in the following areas: (1) Educational diagnosis-selecting, devising, administering and interpreting diagnostic instruments, training others in their use. (2) Prescriptive programming-relating diagnostic findings to educational techniques; selecting, devising, recommending, and testing educational materials for individual children and specific groups of children. (3) Implementing instruction--arranging schedules, groupings, and changing these when needed; training teachers and aides to utilize specialized and innovative methods. (4) Educational evaluation--recording students' responses and progress; selecting and devising techniques to rate and measure the effectiveness of instruction, attitudinal changes, and behavioral changes; recommending additional efforts in any area when indicated.

The teachers scheduled individual conferences with parents. The purpose of such scheduling was to exchange information and observations about the child's academic needs; to discuss the teacher's recommendations for the child's school program and to have parents communicate any particular concerns they had about their child to the teacher.

Curriculum Materials and Methods of Instruction

Teaching materials which differ from those used in the regular classroom were used in the centers. In cases where classroom materials were utilized, different methods and techniques were employed. Specific academic programs which have built-in placement and evaluation materials were used.

As the curriculum of the Center was designed to reflect an awareness of a heterogeneous group of children, a large variety of materials were available, enabling the teachers to match the cognitive style of the learner with the cognitive demands of the task.

An interdisciplinary approach, the Collaborative Service Program, has involved school psychologists, social workers, pupil personnel workers, nurses, special education teachers, physicians, teachers and parents. The Collaborative Service Program was a basis for in-service training which was provided to five Special Education Learning Centers' teachers in a Child Development Consultation role, during May, 1973, and these plus 16 Learning Centers or other special education staff in a Teacher Consultation role during a 1973 summer workshop.

The underlying principles of the Collaborative Services Program were as follows:

(1) Emphasis early in a child's school career on those things which lead to successful learning rather than merely labelling deviancy;

(2) Active involvement and participation of teachers and parents in the diagnostic process;

(3) Collaboration between professionals from the fields of health and education;

(4) Awareness of constraints in the time and personnel available for needed services to the large number of children at risk;

(5) Continual evaluation and adaptation of the program to meet local needs and resources.

As a follow-up of the Spring and Summer workshops, collaborative services were provided to 24 primary grade classrooms in Title I schools during the 1973-1974 school year as a cooperative effort between Special Education Learning Center teachers and Pupil Personnel Workers, with participation wherever possible of school-based special education teachers. Back-up services were provided by Pupil Personnel Aides, psychologists and social workers.

Major Findings and Recommendations

Classroom teachers, principals, parents and Learning Center staff on the whole regard the Special Education Learning Center program very favorably. Though we have not gained access to the test data, it is reported the pre- and posttest achievements were increased for the children exposed to the program.

The basic program design contains features designed to diminish the isolation and stigmatization of exceptional children. The program maintains these children in their peer group regular classes while providing special services to meet their special needs. It is apparent that this is a workable design that affords the best of specialized technical assistance while retaining the social environment of heterogeneous grouping.

Among the most outstanding outcomes of the program was the general satisfaction of those connected with it that they were doing a worthwhile job in helping children. Repeatedly, teachers remarked about the tremendous gains in student effort, learning and self appreciation. The reason for this changed attitude on the part of students and teachers is related closely to the opportunity to work closely with small groups of children on their own terms, with the materials necessary to do the job.

When viewed in problem-solving terms, the program seems to have clearly stated achievable objectives, trained and dedicated people with the necessary time, materials and space to do the job. The work of the Special Education teachers was supported by continuous training and understanding assistance from supervisors. The overall structure, goals and resource allocations of the program seem firmly committed to the success of the program.

There were some limitations on the amount and quality of teacher collaboration for planning and progress assessment. However there was a major training effort directed at fostering this collaboration.

Parents were involved as aides and were encouraged to offer some insights to the program. There is some indication that many parents were not sufficiently informed to meaningfully assess the value of the program. This type of parental involvement cannot be expected within the context and resource limitations of the program as structured.

To some extent the regular teachers did not share the enthusiasm with student progress reflected in the Special Education teacher responses. This may be due in large part to differences in the level and specificity of expectations for the two groups of teachers.

The evaluation team recommends that:

(1) The Special Education Learning Centers (SELC's) should not only be continued, but they should also be further expanded to include: (a) At least some children having more severe learning disabilities than the children presently involved. (b) Additional psychological services, so that one psychologist is not attempting to provide assistance to all five centers. Ideally, a psychologist should be assigned to each center

to work with other staff members and children in finding the best learning approaches for individuals, in assisting staff members and the children themselves to gain insights into behavior problems, and the like. (c) Consultative medical services. Such services might be arranged for by using a training hospital located in the neighborhood or by contracting with local physicians who are specialists in pediatrics. The services provided should include explaining and interpreting special medical information to staff members and parents regarding particular children as it relates to the learning process, providing examinations where no other resources are available in reasonable periods of time, assessment of the general physical and nutritional status of individual children, and the like.

(2) Increased parental participation in the SELC's should be planned for and implemented. The following suggestions are made with regard to increasing parent participation. (a) Parent training workshops focused on such areas as understanding and encouraging the learning program, and medical and nutritional information, including conducting workshops at hours convenient to parents and paying them each an honorarium to attend. (b) Establishment and publicizing of a "drop-in-any-time" policy for parents, so as to see their children learning in the center. (c) Establishment of a parent advisory council for each Center with an active input into the program planning and implementation process.

(3) A more formalized relationship between the teachers of the regular classroom program from which the children come and the staff of the Center serving those children should be established. This relationship could take such forms as: (a) Classroom teachers observing the Learning Center program and vice versa to see and share techniques for working with

a child. (b) Regularly scheduled classroom teacher-center teacher conferences (approximately once a month) to share progress reports, problems encountered, insights regarding individual children. (c) Regularly scheduled workshops for both Center and classroom teachers conducted by a psychologist, pediatrician, psychiatrist, etc., to increase insights into particular children's learning disabilities, as well as into improved ways of dealing with such disabilities as they are manifested by various children.

(4) The procedures for identifying, assessing, and admitting a child into the SELC's program should be streamlined. One way to effect this streamlining would be to use a "total team approach" once the initial identification has been made.

(5) The Learning Center staff should be encouraged to develop and test their own instrumentation for assessing and recording the progress that an individual child is making not only in the academic areas, but also in the non-cognitive areas as well, e.g., improved self-esteem on the part of the participating children.

CHAPTER VIII

STAFF DEVELOPMENT

The purpose of this section is to describe and evaluate the operation and the effectiveness of the Staff Development component of the FY 1974 Title I Program. The objective of the Staff Development concept, as stated in A Manual of Operations for ESEA Title I, was to develop an all inclusive program of Staff Development involving professionals, para-professionals, and parents. Title I principals, teachers, educational aides, support personnel, and parents were to be involved in developmental programs designed to provide each with the knowledge, attitudes, and skills necessary to meet the objectives of the Title I program.

The scope of the program was to include the following activities:

1) Orientation seminars
2) Title I Educational Institute
3) In-Service Courses (D.C. Teachers College)
4) In-Service workshops
5) Conferences and conventions
6) Training sessions
7) On-going assistance

The methods of carrying out the Staff Development program for FY 74 was to take place in three phases. Phase I was Orientation, one half-day session, with citywide attendance required. Phase II was the Title I Educational Institute, a week long intensive instructional period for all field personnel, on a staggered basis. Phase III was the Follow-up Seminars and workshops focusing on instructional issues, problems and practices.

The sources of information utilized for the evaluation of the Staff Development component were the Comprehensive Program of FY 74 and Plan of Operations ESEA, Title I FY 74. In addition, information was drawn from personal interviews with principals and teachers and from questionnaires distributed to key school personnel, such as principals, program coordinators, and teachers.

THE NATURE OF STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES

The nature of Staff Development, according to the Manual of Operations for ESEA, Title I, requires that teachers and other staff members receive special training to carry out their particular assignments. Therefore, teachers and educational aides are encouraged to enroll in Title I in-service courses, earning college credits through D.C. Teachers College. The courses provide teachers with techniques for upgrading pupils' skills in reading and mathematics. Title I classroom teachers are also given the opportunity to attend workshops, conferences, and seminars in other cities.

The Title I Staff Development Program is a training program that provides for effective use of human resources. The program is designed to help teachers and educational aides acquire knowledge and skills that will enable them to help pupils master the basic skills in reading and mathematics as well as other areas.

The major staff development activities conducted in FY 74 were Workshops, Orientation Seminars, Consultant Visitations, and Demonstrations. There were also a conference, a seminar, and several in-service courses in cooperation with the D.C. Teachers College (see Tables VIII-1 and VIII-2). Brief descriptions of the Staff Development activities are given below.

Workshops were practical activities which were carefully planned to help teachers, instructional aides, and parents become familiar with the use of the different reading and mathematics materials programs. For teachers, the workshops were geared toward the development of expertise in the teaching of reading and math, development of leadership skills, and management skills. For aides and parents, the workshops provided training in how to give maximum support to teachers and children and to learn ways to help children improve their reading and math skills.

Orientation Seminars involve Title I teachers, administrators, aides, substitutes, staff members, and support personnel. These seminars focus on acquainting all involved personnel with objectives, directions, organization and resources of the Title I program components. Five such orientation sessions involving 52 participants were held during the academic year 73-74.

Consultant Visitations were provided by the publishing companies in lending assistance in the utilization and understanding of their program equipment and materials.

Demonstrations were often provided by the publishing companies. Teachers, aides and other staff members were introduced to the Competitive Partnership programs. These companies provided the necessary training for the maintenance of those instructional designs within the classroom environment.

Conferences involved the Title I parents, teachers, administrators, and staff. The conference relates to the school curriculum and to the needs of Title I students.

In-Service Courses concentrate on affording Title I staff members an opportunity to increase their competency in the techniques of diagnostic-prescriptive teaching and differentiated instruction. Course work was provided with the support of D.C. Teachers College in four Total Learning Center locations. These courses were as follows:

1) The Dynamics of Reading Instruction in Urban Schools.

This course was designed to provide participants with a variety of methods, techniques, and experiences that will offer alternative directions toward the solution of the myriad of problems in the teaching learning process. This course, conducted October 30, 1973 through January 15, 1974, was a two credit graduate course for professionals and was a two credit undergraduate course for para-professionals.

2) Mathematics in Our World Today.

This course dealt with the learning center approach to teaching mathematics through individualization, the integration of other special subject matter areas with mathematics and the gradual transition from standard measurement to the metric system. This was also a two credit graduate course for professionals and two undergraduate credits for para-professionals. The course ran from November 1, 1973 to January 17, 1974.

3) Affective Teaching in Mathematics.

This two credit graduate course for professionals was designed to provide the teacher with method and content which will enable her to become more sensitive and responsive to the affective as well as the cognitive needs of the student. The course also dealt with making the transition from standard measurement to the metric. The course was held February 21, 1974 through May 2, 1974.

4) Enhancing Reading Instruction through Affective Domain.

This course was designed to present the ways to correlate affective education with current cognitive educational instruction. This involves the "total child" in a balanced learning process that provides for the personal and the academic needs of students. This course was worth two undergraduate credits for para-professionals and it was conducted February 26, 1974 through May 7, 1974.

In addition to these regular academic year training programs, there was also one in-service training session during the summer months. This course was "An Interdisciplinary Approach to Teaching," conducted July 4, 1973 through August 10, 1973.

The "Total Team Approach" to Staff Development is the concept of training Title I personnel and parents in a unified body. The objective of the concept is to deter fragmented training sessions for all staff members and parents involved in Staff Development.

The principals, classroom teachers and the resource teachers were asked what they thought were the most beneficial types of Staff Development activities for FY 74. All groups mentioned workshops involving teachers, parents and aides. Some of the respondents specifically named the Metric Systems Workshop, the Random House Reading Workshop, D.C. Heath Math Workshop and in-building workshops. Demonstrations of new materials and new equipment were also mentioned as beneficial types of activities.

Table VIII - 1

TITLE I STAFF DEVELOPMENT ACTIVITIES DURING 1973-1974 ACADEMIC YEAR

Type of Activities	Number of Sessions	Percentages	Number of People Participated	Percentages
Workshops	18	25	466	19.746
Orientation Seminars	10	13.89	642	27.203
In-Service Courses*	10	13.89	201	8.516
Other Staff Training Sessions	19	26.39	696	29.491
Conferences	4	5.56	76	3.22
Demonstrations	3	4.17	44	1.864
Consultant Visitations	3	4.17	116	4.915
Miscellaneous Sessions	5	6.94	119	5.042
TOTAL	72	100%	2360	100%

---

* These are credit courses through D.C. Teachers College.

Table VIII - 2

PERCENTAGE OF TITLE I TEACHERS FAMILIAR WITH THE "TOTAL TEAM APPROACH"*

Type of Teachers	Number and Percentage Studied	Number and Percentage Familiar	Number and Percentage Unfamiliar	Total Number and Percentages
Elementary Classroom Teachers	53 60%	8 15%	45 85%	53 100%
Elementary Math Resource Teachers	41 46%	7 17%	34 83%	41 100%
Elementary Reading Resource Teachers	44 49%	9 20%	35 80%	44 100%
Secondary Resource Teachers	19 95%	1 5%	18 95%	19 100%
GRAND TOTAL	157 100%	25 16%	132 84%	157 100%

---

* Data based on Interview Responses only.

The school personnel were also asked for their suggestions for improving the Staff Development program.

Their suggestions are listed below:

1)	Provide more staff development sessions.	45%*
2)	Provide better scheduling of workshops.	60%
3)	Provide substitutes to cover classes when aides and teachers attend staff development activities.	70%
4)	Make workshops school-wide.	10%
5)	Provide more teacher in-put.	15%
6)	Allow teachers and aides to attend sessions together.	40%
7)	Develop more professional/para-professional interpersonal relationships.	25%
8)	More academic contact in the sessions.	5%
9)	Pay more attention to policy, budget, and planning conferences.	15%
10)	Activities to be scheduled before school starts or during non-school hours.	15%
11)	Cut down on the number of meetings.	2%

---

* Although percentages are based on the total number surveyed, because each person could make more than one suggestion, the percentage will not total to 100%.

MAJOR FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

1. The present concept of Staff Development for the Title I staff is an excellent one. It was designated as the "total team approach," and referred to the involvement of teachers, principals, aides, and other staff members. The evaluation team in their survey was able to find only 15% of classroom teachers, 17% of elementary reading and mathematics resource teachers, and 5% of secondary resource teachers familiar with the "total team approach." They have acknowledged that the concept has not been practiced as widely as they would like to see it practiced.

It is, therefore, recommended that special effort should be made to popularize the "total team approach" by emphasizing its importance to all principals, teachers, and staff at the initial Title I meeting at the beginning of the school year. It can be further promoted by involving all the instructional and administrative staff members of a given school or region in each Staff Development session of importance.

2. Almost all the principals have pointed out that the announcement for Staff Development activities often reached them after the scheduled activities were over. In spite of their desire to send their teachers and aides to the Staff Development activities, it was too late for them to do so. In some instances, the announcements arrived on the day of the Staff Development activity, making it impossible for them to arrange for substitute teachers to relieve the regular teachers.

It is, therefore, recommended that the Staff Development office should plan a yearly schedule for its activities for the coming year. The schedule should be placed in the principal's hands before the classes begin in September. In addition to the yearly schedule, it will be helpful to have a quarterly or monthly calendar of events, with brief descriptions of the nature of the Staff Development planned. Such preplanned sessions, we believe, would bring about better results insofar as the overall participation of the staff is concerned.

3. Arranging for substitute teachers to handle classes when the regular teachers attend the Staff development sessions has been extremely difficult. It was pointed out as one of the main reasons for poor attendance in Staff Development activities. Although Title I has a provision to give special on-the-job training, it has very little provision to pay for substitute teachers. Consequently, many good programs arranged by the Staff Development office were poorly attended. Many teachers had to cover two or three classes at times in order to release the teachers of those classes for such programs. The practice is unfair to the teachers as well as to the pupils involved.

It is, therefore, recommended that special provision should be made to hire temporary help when the teachers and aides have to attend Staff Development programs so that those attending will derive the maximum benefit from the programs.

4. There is a tremendous need for a variety of Staff Development sessions. There should be more reading and mathematics workshops for elementary classroom teachers, in addition to the ones conducted for the resource teachers. They should be held in continuum and scheduled carefully so that the same people can grow with the program regularly by attending at a time that is convenient to them.

CHAPTER IX

PARENTAL INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

INTRODUCTION

Information on the Parental Involvement Program of Title I in the PSDC was obtained from the Title I Coordinator and from questionnaires and interviews completed by school principals and by parent members of the Parents Advisory Council. The reactions of only public school principals and parents are presented. Results for the non-public schools are presented elsewhere in this report.

The emphasis of this evaluation was to obtain information from parent members of the Parent Advisory Councils and public school principals of the functioning in selected areas of the Parent Advisory Councils in relation to the schools. The emphasis was placed upon the functioning of PACs at the local level; however, certain information is equally applicable to the functioning of the Regional and Citywide PAC's, as indicated by the members' responses to the questionnaire.

It should be noted that there are many other areas of parental and community involvement that are not dealt with in this evaluation. Based upon the review of documents provided by the Title I office, it appeared that sound organization and planning was taking place at the level of the Citywide Council. Additionally, emphasis was being placed on the further development of the Regional and Local PAC's.

PLANNING

The Parental Involvement Program shows evidence of sound planning to involve parents in the Title I Program. The Title I Coordinator provided information on schedules and activities of this component. The Citywide Advisory Council is actively involved in many areas of the program. Regional Advisory Councils were in the process of being organized in 1973-74 and notable progress has been made. The Title I Coordinator has continued to focus upon efforts at individual schools to develop strong local PAC's. School representatives have been appointed, officers have been elected, and many orientation and training programs have been held for the parents.

This component is operating within the spirit and the letter of the DHEW guidelines. Continued effort in the directions already established should continue to improve the overall effectiveness of the program.

REACTIONS OF PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS TO THE PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

Reactions of the public school principals to PAC were obtained from respondents to the Principals' Questionnaire and the Principals' Interview. It should be noted that principals were asked to respond primarily to the PAC in their own school rather than to the regional and citywide PAC.

Table IX - 1 shows the positive results of PAC's in their schools, reported by the public school principals. Of the 74 principals interviewed, only 7 (9.4%) reported little or no positive results, while more than three out of four reported that, in general, parents were involved and cooperative. Table IX - 2 shows how principals reported that PAC members were involved in decision-making. More than one-half of the principals interviewed said that the local PAC was involved in reviewing the budget and in establishing priorities. These results are consistent with those reported by the parents. Again, only

Table IX - 1

POSITIVE RESULTS OF THE LOCAL PAC AS REPORTED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS*

	f	%
Parental Involvement and Cooperation	57	77.0
Positive Attitude Change on the Part of Parents and the Community	17	23.0
Increased Participation in School Activities	11	14.8
Learning Experience for the Parents	8	10.8
Little or No Positive Results	7	9.4

Table IX - 2

INVOLVEMENT OF THE LOCAL PAC IN DECISION MAKING AS REPORTED BY THE PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS*

	f	%
Involved in Reviewing the Budget and Setting Priorites	41	55.4
Review and Advisory Capacity	11	14.8
Extensive Involvement	6	8.1
Participated in Meetings and Workshops	4	5.4
Involved but Not as Much as Desired	9	12.2
Not Involved	8	10.8

---

* From the Principals' Interview

a small percentage of the principals interviewed (10.8%) reported that parents were not involved.

Table IX - 3 shows how parents were recruited for PAC by the schools. Invitations, letters and notices sent to the homes were the most frequently mentioned with 39.2%, and personal contacts by a school staff member were next with 35.1%.

Table IX - 4 shows the ratings given by public school principals (in the Principals' Questionnaire) to the performance of parent volunteer workers and the PAC. The performance of parent volunteer workers is rated "excellent" or "good" by 48.4% of the principals, and "below average" by only 5.0%. PAC is rated "excellent" or "good" by 34.5% of the principals, and "below average" or "poor" by 31.0%. Finally, 38.3% of the public school principals (23/60) cited "lack of parental involvement" as a "major problem in administering the Title I Program" in their school.

Table IX - 5 shows the changes suggested for PAC by public school principals. Heading the list are "more parental and community involvement" (21.6%), "more training for parents" (13.5%), and "more stipends for parents" (10.8%).

Table IX - 3

METHODS FOR RECRUITING PARENTS FOR PAC AS REPORTED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS*

	Yes	
	f	%
Open Invitation, Letters and Notices	29	39.2
Personal Contact by School Staff Member(s)	26	35.1
Pupil Personnel Worker	13	17.6
Program Assistant	7	9.4
Teachers	4	5.4
Counselor, Pupil Personnel Aide, Others	2	6.8
Volunteered	12	16.2
Parents Meetings	10	13.5

---

* From the Principals' Interview

Table IX - 4

PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS' RATINGS OF PAC FROM THE PRINCIPALS' QUESTIONNAIRE

Performance of Parent Volunteer Workers	f	%
Excellent	4	6.7
Good	25	41.7
Average	28	46.6
Below Average	3	5.0
Poor	0	0
	60	100.0
Parent Advisory Council (Local)		
Excellent	3	5.2
Good	17	29.3
Average	20	34.5
Below Average	15	25.8
Poor	3	5.2
	58	100.0
Checked as a Major Problem in Administering the Title I Program		
Lack of Parental Involvement	23	38.3

Table IX - 5

SUGGESTIONS FOR CHANGE FOR PAC REPORTED BY PUBLIC SCHOOL PRINCIPALS*

	f	%
No Suggestions	21	28.4
More Parental and Community Involvement	16	21.6
More Training for Parents	10	13.5
More Stipends for Parents	8	10.8
Need a Program Assistant or Pupil Personnel Worker to Take Charge	4	5.4
Change Arrangements for Meetings for Convenience of Parents	3	4.0
More Communication to Parents from Title I Office	4	5.4
Principal or Teachers Should be in Charge of PAC	2	2.7
Provide Transportation to PAC Members	2	2.7
Other Suggestions	6	8.1

---

* From the Principals' Interview

REACTIONS OF PARENT MEMBERS OF THE PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL (PAC)

A questionnaire was forwarded through the public schools for parent members of the PAC. The parents were asked questions about their involvement and participation in PAC, their opinions of the Title I Program, and suggestions for the PAC and Title I Program. One hundred thirty-one questionnaires were completed by the parents in public schools, including both elementary and secondary public schools, a return rate of about one third of the PAC questionnaires distributed.

Demographic Characteristics

The parents responding to the questionnaires were almost all women, with 98% female and 2% male. All age groups were represented, with the percentage distribution shown in Table IX - 6.

The educational level of the parents (Table IX - 7) ranged from completion of the 6th or 7th grade (7.0%) to some college or other training after high school (17.8%). The number of children enrolled in school was as high as 9 for one family, with about one fourth of the families reporting only one child in school; one third of the families reporting two children in school and the remainder reporting three or more children in school. According to the parents, fully 90% of the children were Title I identified.

Participation in Various PAC Groups

Table IX - 8 shows various PAC groups in which the parents are participating, Table IX - 9 shows the offices held by the parents who completed questionnaires, and Table IX - 10 shows the time period in which the parents first became members of PAC. These results show that questionnaire returns include representation of various PAC groups and constituencies. Included among the parents responding are members of the Citywide and Regional PAC's; parent volunteers, educa-

Table IX - 6

AGE DISTRIBUTION OF PARENT MEMBERS OF THE PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL

Age	Percent
21-30	35.4
31-40	44.1
41-50	17.3
Over 50	3.2
	100.0

Table IX - 7

HIGHEST GRADE COMPLETED - REPORTED BY PARENT MEMBERS OF PAC

Grade Completed	Frequency (f)	Percentage (%)
6th or 7th grade	9	7.0
8th or 9th grade	20	15.5
10th or 11th grade	39	30.2
12th grade	38	29.5
Some college or other training after high school	23	17.8
Total	129	100.0

Table IX - 8

PAC MEMBERSHIP

	Yes	
	f	%
1. Citywide, Regional or Local Membership		
Citywide only	6	4.7
Regional only	13	10.2
Both City-wide and Regional	27	21.1
Sub-Total	46	36.0
Local only	82	64.1
Total	128	100.1
2. Parent-Partners* Volunteer Corps	89	67.6
3. Title I Educational Aide*	23	17.5
4. TOPPS Chorus*	11	8.4

---

* Do not total to 100%

Table IX - 9

PAC OFFICE HOLDERS

PAC Officer	Yes f	Yes %	No f	No %
1973-1974	43	33.9	84	66.1
1972-1973	15	12.4	106	87.6

Type of Office Held This Year	Yes f	Yes %
Chairperson	20	15.8
Vice Chairperson	5	4.0
Recording Secretary or Assistant Recording Secretary	15	11.8
Committee Chairperson or Chaplain	3	2.4
	43	34.0

Level of Office	f	%
City-Wide	2	5.1
Regional	6	15.4
Local	31	79.5
Total	39	100.00

Table IX - 10

TIME OF PAC MEMBERSHIP

Time Period	Became Member of Local PAC		Became Delegate of Regional/ City-wide PAC	
	f	%	f	%
June 1972 or Earlier	15	12.4	8	11.9
Between Sept. 1972 & June 1973	27	22.3	15	22.4
Between Sept. and Dec. 1973	64	52.9	36	53.7
Since January 1974	15	12.4	8	11.9
Total	121	100.0	67	99.9

tional aides, and participants in the TOPPS Chorus; parents holding various offices in the local, regional or citywide PAC; and parents who have been PAC members for several years as well as those who became PAC members in school year 1973-74.

Table IX - 11 shows the number of meetings of the local school PAC and of the regional and citywide PACs that the parents reported attending. More than one-half of the parents reported attending at least five meetings of their local school PAC, about one-half of the meetings held during the school year by the time the questionnaire was administered. Overall, about one-third of the parents reported regular attendance at local school PAC meetings (7 or more meetings), while about another one-third of the parents did not attend very regularly (four meetings or less). Regional and citywide meetings are attended by both delegates and non-delegates. Amont the delegates almost half attended seven or more meetings.

Table IX - 12 shows how the parents became PAC members in the local PAC or in the regional or Citywide PAC. At the local level, about 38% indicate that they were elected in a parents' meeting, and about two-thirds indicate that they were asked to serve by the principal or some other school official. Election by parents or contacts by other parents or PAC members overall are about equally often mentioned as requests to serve by school personnel (85 vs. 79 responses). (In these questions, parents could mark more than one answer.) At the citywide and regional levels, more than 60% were elected by the schools' PAC as the representative.

Table IX - 11

NUMBER OF PAC MEETINGS ATTENDED BY MEMBERS

No. of Meetings Attended	Local School PAC		Regional or City-Wide All Respondents		Regional or City-Wide Delegates Only	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Two or less	18	15.4	16	16.8	2	4.3
Three or four	29	24.8	28	29.5	12	26.1
Five or six	34	29.1	19	20.0	10	21.7
Seven or eight	17	14.5	16	16.8	11	23.9
Nine or ten	13	11.1	9	9.5	5	10.9
Eleven or twelve	6	5.1	7	7.4	6	13.0
Total	117	100.0	95	100.0	46	99.9

Table IX - 12

METHOD OF SELECTION AS A PAC MEMBER

Method of Selection	Local Yes f	%*	Citywide and Regional Yes f	%****
Elected by School's PAC as the Representative**	-	-	27	62.8
Asked to Serve by Another PAC Member	21	18.4	3	7.0
Asked to Serve by Some Parents in Your*** Neighborhoos	21	18.4	-	-
Elected in a Parents' Meeting at Your Child/Children's School***	43	38.7	-	-
Asked to Serve by School Principal	41	36.0	7	16.3
Asked to Serve by Some Other School Official	38	33.3	5	11.6
By Some Unspecified Method	7	4.0	-	-

---

* Based on 114 responses to this question.
** Not asked of local members only.
*** Not asked of citywide or regional PAC delegates
**** Based on 43 citywide or regional members.

PAC Operations

Important in the operation of PACs at all levels is the provision of information to PAC members about the Title I program, the cooperation and leadership of school personnel in keeping PAC members informed and in inviting their advice and suggestions. Documentation and reports provided by the Title I office indicate that major efforts were made to provide PAC members with necessary information, provide training and workshops for both parents and school personnel, and to develop a positive involvement among all parties involved.

The reactions of the parents to these efforts are reflected in the results that follow. In almost all areas, PSDC Title I Parent Involvement Program receives "good marks" from the parents, reflected by positive responses to the program's efforts of 60% to 80% of the parents.

Table IX - 13 shows the information received by the parents. Only 5 parents (4.4%) reported that they had not received information on any of the items listed. This result is not surprising considering the fact that 15 parents only became members since January 1974, and that 18 parents reported attending only one or two meetings in 1973-74. While not all parents recognized receiving all information, between 56% and 69% recall receiving such information as Federal program guidelines and Title I budget information. Perhaps there is room for improvement in this record; however, it is important to recognize that some parents may not fully recall all of the information provided to them. The continuing efforts of the Title I Office's Parental Involvement Program to

Table IX - 13

INFORMATION RECEIVED BY PARENTS FROM TITLE I

Information	Yes f	Yes %
Budget information on how much Title I money is being spent for various services, such as reading, medical assistance	78	69.0
Federal program guidelines for Title I	71	62.8
School system plan of operation for Title I for 1973-74	70	62.5
Number of schools and children in these schools who would be, or are, receiving Title I services	64	56.6
None	5	4.4

disseminate information and provide training and workshops can only serve to cement an already effective program.

Parents' Opinions

Table IX - 14 shows the level of cooperation of various school personnel, as perceived by the parents. In each case more than four out of five parents indicated that "most of the time" school personnel "... work cooperatively with PAC members in meeting the Title I children's needs ..." Only 2% to 3% of the parents viewed the school personnel as non-cooperative. In addition (not presented in the tables), 90% of the parents reported that the principal or a Title I representative meets with them in regard to Title I policies and services.

The parents reporting seem to feel quite clear on their role in PAC and its importance. When asked:

> "Do you and the other PAC members feel that you know what your job is in helping to meet the needs of the Title I children in your school?"

75.8% said "Yes, most of the time."
20.0% said "Yes, some of the time."
and only 4.2% said "No."

Fully 96.7% feel that they "are doing something important ... by serving as a PAC member."

Table IX - 15 shows the areas in which parents report participating in making decisions. The table shows that about two-thirds responded "Yes" to

Table IX - 14

COOPERATION OF SCHOOL PERSONNEL RATED BY PAC MEMBERS

Personnel	Cooperated Most of the Time		Cooperated Once in a While		Did Not Cooperate		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Principal	105	87.5	12	10.0	3	2.5	120	100.0
Classroom Teachers	99	82.5	19	15.8	2	1.7	120	100.0
Pupil Personnel Worker and Pupil Personnel Aide	104	86.7	12	10.0	4	3.3	120	100.0

Table IX - 15

PAC PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

Activity	Yes		No		Not Sure		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Determining the Needs of Children	63	69.2	18	19.8	10	11.0	91	100
Use of Title I Funds in Your School	70	68.6	13	12.8	19	18.1	102	100
Kinds of Services Actually Provided to Children	63	66.3	13	13.7	19	20.0	95	100
Setting Priorities Based on the Needs of Children	47	54.0	16	18.4	24	27.6	87	100
Evaluation of Title I Services in Your School	46	54.1	20	23.5	19	22.4	85	100
Making Changes in the Title I Services	26	33.8	31	40.3	20	26.0	77	100
Selection of Title I STaff	34	39.1	38	43.7	15	17.2	87	100

the following statements:

"Determining the Needs of Children

"Use of Title I Funds in Your School

"Kinds of Services Actually Provided to Children

More than one-half (54%) of the parents answered "Yes" to these statements:

"Setting Priorities Based on the Needs of Children

"Evaluation of Title I Services in Your School"

It should be noted that the number of parents answering these questions was not very large, ranging from 77 to 102 out of the 131 questionnaires (about 59% to 78%) completed by the parents. Possibly some of the parents did not interpret the question as dealing with providing advice and suggestions because the question is worded in terms of "participation in decision making."

Table IX - 16 shows the participation of Citywide and Regional PAC members in decision making. By and large, the percentage of "Yes" responses is at least as high as for the general PAC membership.

Table IX - 17 shows the Citywide and Regional PAC members' views of the cooperation of Title I and other school officials in various activities. Again, from about half to about four out of five responded in the affirmative.

PAC Regional Officers were asked to rate the PAC Leadership Training Institute "... in terms of its usefulness to your work as a PAC member." Res-

Table IX - 16

REGIONAL OR CITY-WIDE PAC PARTICIPATION IN DECISION MAKING

Activity	Yes		No		Not Sure		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Sharing Information with Local School PACs	47	88.7	1	1.9	5	9.4	53	100
Setting Priorities for Services Based on the Needs of Children	37	69.8	9	17.0	7	13.2	53	100
Recommending Changes in the Title I Program Services Based on Results	29	60.4	9	18.8	10	20.8	48	100
Allocation of Title I Funds for the Priorities that Have Been Set	29	59.2	10	20.4	10	20.4	49	100
Making Changes in the Title I Program Based on the Results	24	53.3	8	17.8	13	28.9	45	100
Selection of Title I Staff	22	51.2	14	32.6	7	16.3	43	100

Table IX -17

COOPERATION OF TITLE I STAFF AND OTHER SCHOOL OFFICIALS WITH REGIONAL/CITYWIDE PAC MEMBERS IN VARIOUS ACTIVITIES

Activity	Yes		No		Not Sure		Total	
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%
Providing Information on Various Programs Paid For by Title I Money, like Reading or Mathematics	49	84.5	2	3.5	7	12.1	58	100
Providing Title I Budget Information	53	82.8	4	6.3	7	10.9	64	100
Providing Title I Program Guidelines	47	78.3	3	5.0	10	16.7	60	100
Mutually Arriving at Priorities for Spending Title I Money	43	75.4	7	12.3	7	12.3	57	100
Setting the Guidelines for Determining the Needs of the Title I Children	37	62.7	9	15.3	13	22.0	59	100
Providing Evaluation Reports	32	61.5	8	15.4	12	23.1	52	100
Planning The Title I Program for Each Year	34	59.7	12	21.1	11	19.3	57	100
Making Changes in the Title I Program Services Based on the Results with Children	28	52.8	10	18.9	15	28.3	53	100

ponses were as follows:

	f	%
Very useful	30	61.2
Somewhat useful	6	12.2
Not useful	0	0.0
Did not attend	13	26.5
	49	99.9

Table IX - 18 shows how the parents feel about the Title I program as a PAC member. Topping the list with more than four out of five parents, are better teaching of reading and mathematics and more special services like hot lunches, clothing and medical assistance. Almost three out of four saw Title I as providing "... more decision making .. over your child's ... education," and two out of three parents felt Title I also provided "more jobs for parents."

Table IX - 19 confirms the emphasis on reading and mathematics given by the Title I program. More than nine out of ten parents feel that their school is doing a good job in these areas.

Table IX - 20 shows that between 7 and 9 out of 10 parents feel that the school is doing a good job in providing food, clothing, medical attention, field trips, and special testing. The fact that only three out of ten parents feel that the school is doing a good job in job preparation is not surprising inasmuch as not all of the schools have actually implemented a career education concept at the elementary level. Furthermore, many parents of elementary school children may not be aware of career awareness efforts actually used by the schools. Those parents answering in the affirmative probably represent parents of secondary school pupils in career education programs.

Table IX - 18

WHAT TITLE I MEANS TO PAC MEMBERS

	f	%
Better Teaching of Reading	110	85.9
More Special Services for Children, i.e., Hot Lunches, Clothing, Medical Assistance	109	85.2
Better Teaching of Mathematics	107	83.6
More Decision-Making for Parents Over their Children's Education	93	72.7
More Jobs for Parents	86	67.2
More Field Trips for Children	71	55.5

Table IX -19

PARENTS' VIEWS OF WHETHER THEIR SCHOOL IS DOING A GOOD JOB IN TEACHING

Subjects	Yes		No		Not Sure	
	f	%	f	%	f	%
Reading	113	90.4	2	1.6	10	8.0
Mathematics	113	91.1	4	3.2	7	5.7
Science	80	74.1	3	2.8	25	23.2
Social Studies	82	75.2	1	0.9	26	23.9
Other Subjects	10	76.9	1	7.7	2	15.4

Table IX - 20

PARENTS' VIEWS OF WHETHER THEIR SCHOOL IS DOING A GOOD JOB IN PROVIDING VARIOUS SERVICES

	Yes		No		Not Sure	
Services	f	%	f	%	f	%
Food	98	87.5	7	6.3	7	6.3
Special Testing, like Vision or Hearing	96	85.0	3	2.7	14	12.4
Field Trips	35	83.3	2	4.8	5	11.9
Special Tutoring in Reading or Mathematics	90	83.3	6	5.6	12	11.1
Medical Attention	83	76.9	8	7.4	17	15.8
Clothing	81	70.9	8	7.7	15	14.4
Job Preparation	26	30.14	18	25.7	26	37.1

Communication with Parents Outside of PAC

The interest, concern, and perception of parents of Title I students who are not members of PAC is an indicator of the concern for education in the community in which the school is located. As community members and parents, parent members of PAC are probably most closely attuned to the viewpoints, interests and concerns of others in their community. Table IX - 21 shows their responses to questions intended to gauge the community interest and concern. The responses to these questions suggest a two-way division in school-community relations among the communities in which Title I students are located:

1. Educationally active, participatory, and interested communities. These communities may be characterized in terms of the PAC parents' responses as those in which "... most parents are interested .. in what the school is doing for their children ..." (44.8%); "... most parents think the school is doing a good job ... in teaching their children ..." (37.0%); and those in which parents inform PAC members when they don't like something that happens to their children in school (frequently 36.1%; once in a while, 36.9%).
2. Educationally passive and disinterested communities. These communities may be characterized in terms of the PAC parents' responses as those in which, "... most parents are not interested ... in what the school is doing for their children ..." (36.0%); "... most parents don't know ... how good a job ... the school is doing in teaching their children ..." (32.3%);

Table IX - 21

PAC MEMBERS PERCEPTIONS OF COMMUNITY INTEREST BASED ON THREE QUESTIONS

	f	%
"How interested are the parents in your neighborhood in what the school is doing for their children?"		
Most parents are interested	56	44.8
Most parents are not interested	45	36.0
No Opinion	24	19.2
Total	125	100.0
"How good a job do the parents in your neighborhood think the school is doing in teaching their children?"		
Doing a good job	47	37.0
Not doing a good job	9	7.1
Most parents do not know	41	32.3
No Opinion	30	23.6
Total	127	100.0
Parents frequently tell PAC members when they do not like something that happens to their children in school.	44	36.1
Once in a while parents tell PAC members when they do not like something that happens to their children in school.	45	36.9
Parents do not tell PAC members when they do not like something that happens to their children in school.	33	27.0
Total	122	100.0

and those in which parents do not tell PAC members "... when they don't like something that happens to their children in school ..." (27.0%).

These results suggest that greater parental and community involvement and interest in the school need to be developed in about one in three of the neighborhoods served by Title I schools.

These observations are consistent with those of the public school principals (see especially Table IX - 5)

The high level of interest in education of those PAC parents completing the questionnaires is indicated by their responses in Table IX - 22. the percentage who talk with their children a great deal about doing well in school (89.8%) and those who give their children a great deal of help with their school work (69.5%).

Suggestions for Changes in Title I Services

Table IX - 23 shows the parents' suggestions for improving Title I services. Topping the list are two general categories, each with subcategories. The two major recommendations are:

"Parents working in the schools	18.8%
"Improving the administration of the program"	13.3%

The wide range of recommendations should be given consideration by the Title I Office.

Table IX - 22

PARENT-CHILD INTERACTION REGARDING EDUCATION

	f	%
Help children a great deal with school work (reading, mathematics, spelling, etc.)	89	69.5
Help children some with school work (reading, mathematics, spelling, etc.)	39	30.5
Total	128	100.0

	f	%
Talk a great deal with children about doing well in school.	114	89.8
Talk some with children about doing well in school.	12	9.5
Do not talk very much with children about doing well in school.	1	0.8
Total	127	100.0

Table IX - 23

PAC MEMBERS' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR CHANGES IN TITLE I SERVICES

	f	%
Parents working in schools	24	18.8
1) Parents should work more hours	11	8.6
2) More parents hired full-time	5	4.0
3) Parents should work the whole year	5	9.0
4) More jobs for parents	3	2.3
Improving the administration of the program	17	13.3
1) Extend program for children to other groups	9	7.0
2) More money for the Title I Program	3	2.3
3) More special programs and teachers for emotional children	3	2.3
4) More vocational courses for children	1	.8
5) School should remain in T-I program at least three years	1	.8
More parental interest in children and more parent input in the program	16	12.5
More training, meetings, and useful activities in workshops for parents	7	5.5
More educational aides and have parents work as educational aides	7	5.5
Better communications and clearer guidelines	4	3.1
More acceptance of parents by teachers	4	3.1
More field trips for students	4	3.1
Miscellaneous	10	7.8

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

In general, there is little question, based on the responses of public school principals and parent members of PAC, that the PAC's are viewed very favorably.

However, in terms of improvements in the Parental Involvement Program, principals and parents alike indicated that even more involvement on the part of parents would be desirable, even though the level of parental involvement was already a strong point. For example, 77% of the public school principals indicated that "parental involvement and cooperation was a positive result of the local PAC"(Table IX - 1).

However, about 38% of the principals cited "lack of parental involvement" as a "major problem in administering the Title I Program" in 1973-74. Additionally, when asked for suggestions for change for PAC, public school principals responded most frequently with "more parental and community involvement," "more training for parents," and "more stipends for parents" (Table IX - 5). Generally, the parents seem to agree (Table IX - 23).

It may be important that only 35% of the principals indicated that their efforts to recruit parents for PAC involved a personal contact made by a school staff member. It seems likely that personal contacts would be more productive than printed literature in encouraging the participation of parents (Table IX - 3). The PAC members' perceptions of community interest in the schools in their neighborhoods (see Table IX - 21) suggests that there is relatively little interest in perhaps one-fourth to one-third of the neighborhoods served by Title I schools. These observations suggest renewed attention on the part of the individual schools to personal contacts in the neighborhoods, by school staff members and PAC members alike, to engage the interest of parents in the community. The fact that the Title I program has developed local school budgeting may provide for more extensive employment of Parent Volunteers. It is noteworthy that almost half of the public school principals rated the performance of Parent Volunteer Workers as "good" or "excellent", and only 5% of the principals rated them as below average.

Based on these observations, it is recommended that the Parental Involvement Component of Title I continue to give attention to the strengthening of local PAC's through efforts in neighborhoods (where appropriate) to broaden the base of parents involved in the schools. To do so may require greater effort at the local level of PAC school representatives, other staff members and PAC members in making personal contacts with parents. It is also recommended that the Parent Volunteer program be expanded whenever possible.

CHAPTER X

SPECIAL PROJECTS AND CULTURAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

The purpose of this section is to report on the effectiveness of the Special Projects in the Title I Schools. According to the ESEA Title I Comprehensive Program, FY 1974, the Title I Special Projects were to include Career Development, Community Schools, Follow-Through Centers and the Pre-School Expansion Program.

CAREER DEVELOPMENT

The Career Development Project has three specific components: (1) Pilot Career Foundations, (2) Widening Horizons, and (3) Industrial Arts Career.

1. The Pilot Career Foundation program introduces Title I students to basic economic concepts, such as jobs and salaries, vocational opportunities, etc. In elementary schools, the project is designed to emphasize the study of technology and the secondary school project encompasses a survey of a full range of career opportunities. The target population is selected from seven elementary schools and one junior high school. The program is intended to service approximately 1,000 students.

2. The Widening Horizons Career Orientation Program provides career education for Title I seventh graders who are potential dropouts. The project includes an exploration of specific career clusters, guidance services to aid in self-assessment of abilities, aptitudes and interests. The program serves approximately 960 identified Title I students. The criteria for recruiting these students will include: absenteeism, poor or failing

grades, frequent school transfers, over-age for regular grade placement, financial difficulties or family problems.

3. The Industrial Arts Career Project is an inter-disciplinary exploration of careers in the construction industry utilizing an applied technological approach. The project involves five Title I junior high schools. The Title I students will acquire a broad understanding of the construction industry, the occupational opportunities that exist and are likely to occur in the future and the skills directly associated with success in employment.

Sufficient information on the operations and the participation in the Career Development Projects was not available for an objective evaluation of the projects and their components. However, the interest and enthusiasm expressed by the staff and students in each of these programs were extremely high.

Career education is becoming more important as the unemployment level among white collar workers steadily increases in the United States. Many of the Career Development Centers visited have reported that the students participating in their programs are more punctual and seldom absent when compared to their attendance in regular school programs. It indicates that students who are often disinterested in the regular academic program tend to be extremely interested in career development programs of the school. Despite this fact, there are only limited facilities for involving all interested and needy students.

It is, therefore, recommended that every effort be made to introduce career related training programs, particularly the Industrial Arts Program, in each of the 16 junior high schools currently participating in the Title I program. It is further recommended that an effort be made to introduce "the

Table X - 1

NUMBER AND PERCENTAGE OF STUDENTS PARTICIPATING IN THE TITLE I CAREER DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

Type of Program	Schools Participating		Number of Students Participating	Percentage of Students Participating
	Elementary	Secondary		
1. Pilot Career Foundation	7	1	1000	20%
2. Widening Horizons	-	16	960	21%
3. Industrial Arts Career Project	-	2*	260*	6.35%

---

* These figures are based on information collected from Randall and Stuart Junior High Schools, where these programs are in operation.

Pilot Career Foundations Program" in all the elementary and non-public schools because it lays the proper foundation in young hearts for career education, which can result in better workers for tomorrow.

COMMUNITY SCHOOLS

The basic premises of the program operations are that the community school program is an extension of the formal academic program through informal education programs; that development of an effective program is a shared responsibility of administration, staff, parents, community and students; and that the community school provides opportunities for parents to participate in school and community programs. The Garnet-Patterson Community School program is designed to assist identified Title I seventh grade students in improving their reading and mathematics skills through small group instruction and after school tutoring, and in preparing homework assignments.

The Garnet-Patterson Community School also offered an "out-reach program" to students at Grimke Elementary School. The focus of this outreach program was to attune the students to the community program at Garnet-Patterson. These students who would attend Garnet-Patterson this fall participated in the slimnastics and photography classes as well as in the tutorial program. There were also students from Cardozo High School participating in the creative expression class.

One of the outstanding features of the Garnet-Patterson Community School was that the program fostered increasing adult community involvement. Another significant feature of this program was that former students returned to the karate and photography classes to share their skills with the younger students.

Table X-2

SPECIFIC PROJECT OFFERINGS AND NUMBER OF PARTICIPANTS IN THE PROGRAM AT GARNET-PATTERSON COMMUNITY SCHOOL

Classes	Number of Participants
Gymnastics	20
Creative Design	19
New Math	30
English Drama	15
Creative Expression (Music)	25
Karate	15
Photography	8
Slimnastics	20
Tutorial Program	39
Income Tax Program	15
Environmental Science	12
Total	218

As related by the Program Coordinator, there were no significant problems in the operations of Garnet-Patterson Community Project. The only problem encountered was an incorrect statement of project expenditures. Apparently, other projects' expenditures had been charged against Garnet-Patterson.

Additional classes will be offered at the school during the 1974-75 school year. These classes are:

English Journalism
Barber Science
Instrumental Music
Graphic Communications, and
Woodwork Technology

Two classes, Mother and Baby Care, and Mother's Aide, will be offered through the assistance of the American Red Course.

It appears that the Garnet-Patterson Community School Project is operating efficiently. The participants appear to be quite pleased with the program offerings. However, the project needs increased community involvement, particularly from parents of the children who participate in the program. The objective for the FY-1975 project is to increase parental involvement in the project.

The Harrison Community School is designed to provide elementary age students instruction in science, library usage, music, art, and physical education. Pre-school age students are offered exercises designed to foster readiness, coordination, language skills, and self-awareness. Students are provided homework centers, remedial assistance, and developmental classes to raise mathematics and reading levels. Like the Garnet-Patterson Community School, this school also needs full support from the local community in order to make its program a success. The community school concept is an excellent one, and it needs continued support through the Title I program.

The evaluation team was quite pleased with the contributions of the Community School Programs towards better and increased involvement of the local community in public school programs, and it strongly recommends that a major emphasis should be placed in popularizing the concept within PSDC in general, and Title I schools in particular. One of the ways of doing it is by setting up at least two additional community school centers with increased budget to expand the program activities.

LUDLOW PRESCHOOL PROGRAM

The major objectives of the Ludlow Preschool Program were to provide an acceleration of the normal development of intellectual skills, reinforcement for learning, and to help children acquire the basic skills for learning.

The program encompassed "material oriented," "teacher oriented," and "child oriented" teaching methods. The program stresses language development as it relates to stimulating and shaping the child's ability to form concepts, to perceive his environment clearly and to respond effectively. The program also fosters self-motivation for the child.

The program was held at 12 schools. There were 20 prekindergarten groups and 10 kindergarten groups in each of the 12 schools. The program also included 50 prekindergarten and kindergarten children at the Spanish Development Cehter.

This program appeared to have a lot of merit in accelerating the learning ability of youngsters. The involvement of children, with bilingual background, in the program was quite timely, and it added a new dimension to the Title I services. It will be helpful to have a follow-up study conducted to find out the level of growth each child might attain in the first grade, upon completion of the kindergarten and pre-school programs.

It is recommended that the program be continued at the same level for another year, and at the end of next year a follow-up study be conducted to see how far the students excelled in the first grade due to their involvement in the special pre-school program. It is further recommended that every effort should be made to increase the services to children with bilingual background so that they will have an equal chance with the non-bilingual children to improve their learning abilities.

CULTURAL ENRICHMENT PROGRAM

The purpose of the Cultural Enrichment Program was to reinforce Mathematics and Reading skills by extending and enriching a child's cultural background through Fine Arts, Music, and field trip experiences.

The program was divided into two: (1) the field trips where transportation was provided to each activity, and (2) the field (school) based performances.

The field trips fell into two categories - the teacher initiated trips and the coordinator initiated trips.

The coordinator initiated field trips were to the Black Repertoire Dance Company with 5,000 Title I students attending and to a piano performance by Leon Baits with 5,000 students attending.

The Field Based Performances were required to be geared to improving Mathematics and Reading skills. The types of performances included plays, creative drama, musical productions, dance groups and, specifically, a Magic Show. These field based performances involved all Title I students at that school.

There were three Common Based Activities held for all third grade Title I students. These activities provided the students with a commonly shared experience.

1) The Capitol Tour - field trip involving about 4,000 students.
2) Concerts in School Festival at the Kennedy Center - 4,000 students attended.
3) The Library Theatre - about 4,000 students attended.

The program provided for involvement of children in cultural experiences in their community and for enriching the child's background. The program involved children in field trip experiences, Music and Fine Arts, to extend and enrich their background experiences, thus providing reinforcement in Reading and Mathematics skills.

One problem cited by 90% of the principals, 85% of the parents, and 70% of the teachers was the inability to provide Common Based experiences for all grade levels of Title I. This was due to limited funds available to provide such experiences. All programs held were well received by parents and children alike, and school officials expressed great satisfaction in the way they were conducted.

Most teachers felt that there should be more field trips for the children to parks, arboretums, fairs, etc. Buses should be more readily available to school officials to plan the field trips more quickly.

It is, therefore, recommended that provision should be made for a minimum of four field trips for each school during the school year. If any school wishes to have more than that, special arrangements should be made by order of priority. Library Theatre, and Special Concerts for children should be continued for the simple reason that for a majority of them it might be the first exposure to any meaningful cultural experience.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A - 1. PRINCIPALS' QUESTIONNAIRE

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ESEA TITLE I EVALUATION
1973-74

(1) QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PRINCIPALS

(2) **Directions:** Please answer all questions with regard to the Title I Program in your school this year.

I. BASIC DATA

Name of the principal (optional) ______________________________

(3,4) Name and address of the school ______________________________

____

(5,6) How many years have you been a principal in a Title I school?

__________(years)

(7,8) How many years altogether have you been a principal ________(years)

(8,9) How many years have you been in the field of education _____(years)

(10-29) For each grade, please list the number of classes or sections of Title I students in your school.

	Grade	Number of Classes/Sections
(10,11)	Kindergarten	________
(12,13)	1	________
(14,15)	2	________
(16,17)	3	________
(18,19)	4	________
(20,21)	5	________
(22,23)	6	________
(24,25)	7	________
(26,27)	8	________
(28,29)	TOTAL	________

(30-53) List the number of (Personnel) working full or part-time at your school for the Title I Programs. (Do not include regular classroom teachers)

		Full-time	Part-time
(30,31)	Reading Resource Teacher		
(32,33)	Mathematics Resource Teacher		
(34,35)	Pupil Personnel Worker		
(36,37)	Pupil Personnel Aide		
(38,39)	Educational Aide		
(40,41)	Program Assistant		
(42,43)	Clinical Psychologist		
(44,45)	Social Worker		
(46,47)	Speech Therapist		
(48,49)	Health Aide		
(50,51)	Other (Please specify)		
(52,53)			

Office Use Only:
Card 2, 1-4
____

(54-74) For each grade, please list for this years' Title I program, the number of students enrolled, the number of students who transferred in or out of your school, and the number of students who dropped out of school. In the last column, please list the total days absent.

	Grade	Student Enrollment	Transfers		Dropouts	Absences
			Out	In		
(54-63)	Kindergarten					
(64-73)	1					
(5-14)	2					
(15-24)	3					
(25-34)	4					
(35-44)	5					
(45-54)	6					
(55-64)	7					
(65-74)	8					

Office Use Only:
Card 3, 1-4
____

II. PROGRAMATIC DATA

Please rate the Title I programs, personnel, facilities, and other factors about your school on the scale given below by circling the appropriate number. Please omit those items not pertinent to your school. 5 is excellent, 4 is good, 3 is average, 2 is below average, and 1 is poor.

		Ex	G	Av	B Av	Poor
(5)	Classroom Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
(6)	Performance of Custodial staff	5	4	3	2	1
(7)	Performance of Teacher Aides	5	4	3	2	1
(8)	Performance of Parent Volunteer workers	5	4	3	2	1
(9)	Pupil personnel services	5	4	3	2	1
(10)	Cultural Enrichment programs	5	4	3	2	1
(11)	Title I Corrective program	5	4	3	2	1
(12)	Math Remediation program	5	4	3	2	1
(13)	Parent Advisory Council	5	4	3	2	1
(14)	Competitive Partnership Programs (If available in your school)	5	4	3	2	1
(15)	Performance of the Clerical staff	5	4	3	2	1
(16)	Clothing program	5	4	3	2	1
(17)	Special Education Learning Center (If available at your school)	5	4	3	2	1
(18)	Speech Correction Program	5	4	3	2	1
(19)	Cooperation from the Title I Coordinators	5	4	3	2	1
(20)	Availability of Necessary supplies and materials for the Title I Instructional program	5	4	3	2	1
(21)	Classroom facilities as they effect the implementation and operation of a Title I Program	5	4	3	2	1

		Ex	G	Av	B Av	Poor
(22)	Performance of Reading Resource Teacher	5	4	3	2	1
(23)	Performance of Math Resource Teacher	5	4	3	2	1
(24)	Availability of necessary audio-visual equipment	5	4	3	2	1
(25)	Cooperation from LEA and/or SEA Title I Office of D.C. Public Schools	5	4	3	2	1
(26)	Cooperation from the office of the Superintendent of Instruction, D.C. Public Schools	5	4	3	2	1
(27)	Staff Development program	5	4	3	2	1
(28)	Coordination efforts between classroom teachers & the Reading/Math Resource Teachers	5	4	3	2	1
(29)	Utilization of Title I funds	5	4	3	2	1
(30)	Reliability of the Tests (Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test, California Achievement Test and CTBS) administered for the Title I Program by the D.C.P.S. in view of the overall performance of your students	5	4	3	2	1
(31)	Validity of the test results in view of the overall performance of your students	5	4	3	2	1
(32)	Effectiveness of the MEDIAX program in developing children's perceptual skills	5	4	3	2	1

III. GENERAL DATA

(33-38) What are some of the most significant and positive experiences that you have encountered in this year's Title I program?

(Please number by priority order)

(39-41) Were there some difficult experiences in this year's Title I Program?

(Please number by priority order)

(42-62) What were some of the major problems you have encountered in administering this year's Title I program? (Mark all that apply.)

(42) Inadequate staffing ____

(43) Delay in releasing funds ____

(44) Too much administrative bureaucracy in the overall Title I administration ____

(45) Lack of parental involvement ____

(46) Too much paper work ____

(47) Discipline in the school ____

(48) Low staff morale ____

(49) Overcrowded classrooms ____

(50) Inadequate facilities ____

(51) Too much added administrative work due to the Title I Program ____

(52) Poorly planned Staff Development programs ____

(53) Low salary to attract quality people as teachers ____

(54) Too many part-time professional staff ____

(55) Inadequate library ____

(56) Reading Program ____

(57) Mathematics Program ____

(58) None of the above ____

(59) Other (Please specify)

(60) ______________________________

(61) ______________________________

(62) ______________________________

____

Office Use Only:
Card 4 and 5, 1-4

____

How many of the personnel listed below from your school had attended the following Staff Development Programs during 1973-74 academic year?

STAFF LIST	Credit Courses	Lectures	Workshops	Conferences	Seminars	Pre-Training Workshops	Language Skills Inst. (March'74)	Other
Classroom Teacher								
Reading Resource Teacher								
Math Resource Teacher								
Educational Aide								
Non-Teaching Professional Staff (Specify, if any):								
Other (Indicate)								

(63-80) Please state any additional comments that you may have on the Title I Programs in general and the programs at your school in particular:

APPENDIX A - 2. CLASSROOM & RESOURCE TEACHERS' QUESTIONNAIRE

CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION

(1)

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR CLASSROOM TEACHERS AND RESOURCE TEACHERS

(2) General: This questionnaire contains a number of sections appropriate to various personnel. Please read the directions for each section and answer only those questions that apply to you.

(3,4) I. IDENTIFICATION

Name ______________________________

(5,6) Name and address of school ______________________________

____

(7) Type of school

___ 1. Public Elementary

___ 2. Public Secondary

___ 3. Non-public

(8) Your position

___ 1. Classroom teacher

___ 2. Reading resource teacher

___ 3. Mathematics resource teacher

(9) Your sex

___ 1. Male

___ 2. Female

(10) Age

___ 1. Below 20 years

___ 2. 20 - 29 "

___ 3. 30 - 39 "

___ 4. 40 - 49 years

___ 5. 50 or over

II. PROFESSIONAL DATA

(11) Highest Degree Earned

___ 1. Less than a B.A./B.S.

___ 2. B.A./B.S.

___ 3. M.A./M.S./M.Ed.

___ 4. Master's plus or Advanced Professional Certificate

___ 5. Doctorate

___ 6. Other (Specify) ____________________

(12-13) Please indicate the kind of certification you currently hold in your area:

	Mathematics	Reading
1. Provisional Certificate	___	___
2. Probationary Provisional	___	___
3. Probationary Standard	___	___
4. Reading Teacher	___	___
5. Reading Specialist	___	___
6. Mathematics Resource Teacher	___	___
7. Mathematics Teacher	___	___
8. Other (Specify)		
____________________	___	___

(14,15) Are you presently pursuing another type of certification?

___ 1. NO

___ 2. YES - If YES, Type: ________________________________

Number of courses completed by end of term ______

(16-29) Years of teaching experience:

1. Total teaching experience ______ years
2. Teaching of Title I students ______ years
3. Pre-kindergarten or HeadStart ______ years
4. Kindergarten ______ years
5. Primary - Grades 1 - 3 ______ years
6. Elementary - Grades 4 - 6 _______ years
7. Grades 7 and 8 _______ years

III. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

(30-58) For each type of staff Development program listed below, please give the number of sessions you attended and your rating of each for Title I and regular programs. Use the following rating scale:

5 = Excellent
4 = Good
3 = Fair
2 = Poor
1 = Did not participate

1973 - 1974 School Year

TYPE	A. Regular Staff Development Program		B. Title I Staff Development Program	
	Number of Sessions	Over-all Rating	Number of Sessions	Over-all Rating
Credit Courses				
Workshops				
Conferences				
Seminars				
Pre-Training Wrkshps.				
Language Skills Inst. (March '74)				
Other (Specify)				

(59-66) Please rate the following teaching methods used in staff development programs in which you participated. Use the following rating scale:

5 = Excellent
4 = Good
3 = Fair
2 = Poor
1 - Did not participate in this type of activity

1973 - 1974 School Year

TYPE	A. Regular Staff Development Program	B. Title I Staff Development Program
Classroom Visitation		
Group Dynamics Sessions		
Discussion Groups		
Demonstration		

QUESTIONS 3 & 4 ARE FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL ONLY. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL SKIP TO QUESTION 71.

(67) Was your training in the use of special classroom materials for the Competitive Partnership Program provided before or after the program implementation?

___ 1. Before
___ 2. After
___ 3. Both
___ 4. Did not participate

(68) Please rate the training you received for the Competitive Partnership Program.

___ 1. Excellent
___ 2. Good
___ 3. Fair
___ 4. Poor
___ 5. Did not participate

(69) List two specific ways in which you feel the Staff Development Program could be made more effective.

1.

2.

(70) Have you attended any of the following conventions or conferences this year?

	YES	NO
1. District-wide professional conference	___	___
2. An out-of-state professional conference	___	___

IV. ENROLLMENT

(71-76) Please provide the following enrollment information for your classes:

	Number of Students
1. Total students in all classes	__________
2. Total Title I students in all classes	__________
3. Number of different classes or sections with Title I students	________ classes/sections

(77,78) How many Title I children have been transferred out of your classroom this school year? ________

(79,80) How many have been transferred in to your classroom this school year? _______

V. READING - (Secondary Mathematics Teachers and Mathematics Resource Teachers, SKIP to Section VI.)

QUESTIONS 8 - 17 IN THIS SECTION ARE FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL ONLY. NON-PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL SKIP TO QUESTION 6.

(8-15) Please check the Title I Competitive Partnership reading program used in your classroom this year and last year.

	This year	Last year
1. D. C. Health	________	________
2. McGraw-Hill	________	________
3. Random House	________	________
4. None of the above	________	________

(16,17) Give the number of Title I students in your room this year who are using the same CP program they used during the 1972 - 1973 school year. ____________

(18,19) Please check the month you started the Competitive Partnership Program this year and indicate when the reading books arrived for the students to use.

Month CP Started

___ September
___ October
___ November
___ December
___ January
___ February
___ March
___ April
___ May

Month Reading Books Arrived

___ September
___ October
___ November
___ December
___ January
___ February
___ March
___ April
___ May

(20-25) If you did not receive your CP reading materials in September with what materials were you supplied?

	PUBLISHER	TITLE OF SERIES
1.		
2.		
3.		

(26) Did you have access to the materials this year which you used in the CP program for 1972-1973?

1.____ YES 2. ____ NO

(27-37) Please list the reading series and materials (other than the CP programs) that you use most often with your Title I students. Please check the one series which is your basal or adapted series.

TITLE	PUBLISHER	Basal Series
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

(38-51) Who made the decision to use the reading materials listed below in your classroom? (Please check (✓) or mark all others that apply.

	Title I Program	Regular Program
1. Central Administration	____	____
2. School Administration	____	____
3. Title I Staff	____	____
4. Reading Resource Teacher	____	____
5. Classroom Teacher alone	____	____
6. Both Reading Resource and the Classroom Teacher	____	____
7. Other (Specify) ______________________	____	____

(52-57) On the average, how many minutes per week do you devot to each program?

1. _____regular reading program 2._____Title I reading program _____Total

(58) Are the professional services provided your Title I students by the Reading Resource Teacher and the Regular District Reading Specialist of equal time? 1.______Yes 2.________No

(59) Please check the one showing how you usually organize your Title I students for reading instruction.

___ 1 Small groups (10 or less)

___ 2 Large groups (more than 10)

___ 3 Individualized

___ 4 Other (Specify) ____

(60-74) For the following list of teaching activities please check those that you use in teaching your Title I students. Place a second check (in the last column) for the three activities that you use the most.

		USED	THREE MOST USED
1.	Listening Skills	______	______
2.	Study Skills	______	______
3.	Decoding or Word Attack Skills	______	______
4.	Comprehension Skills	______	______
5.	Oral Language Development	______	______
6.	Oral Reading Skills	______	______
7.	Silent Reading Skills	______	______
8.	Written Composition	______	______
9.	Spelling	______	______
10.	Dictation	______	______
11.	Handwriting	______	______
12.	Others (Specify)	______	______

____

____

(25) Do you keep an individual pupil profile book or form to indicate the student's competency in each skill area?

___ 1. on all Title I students

___ 2. on some Title I students

___ 3. on none

(76,66) How many times per week do you do the following (list the number of times)

1. Read to your students ______

2. Tell a story to your students ____

(78) Is your classroom equipped with a library?

____ YES ___ NO

If YES, what is the source of funding?

___ 1. Regular budget ___ 3 Other

___ 2. Title I budget ________________

Do your students have a silent free reading period each day

(8,9) ____ YES ___ NO

Office Use Only
Card 3 1 - 7

Are the children in the classroom free to take the books home?

____ YES ___ NO

If YES, please check

___ 1. From the classroom library?

___ 2. From the school library?

(10) Are the children in the classroom free to take their text books home to do home assignments?

____ YES ___ NO

(11) Does the school have a well-equipped library? ______1. YES ______2. No

(12) Is the librarian _____1. full time or ______2. part time?

(13) How many times per week is your class scheduled to visit the school library?

(14) How many times per week does your class visit the school library?

Once________ Twice__________ Three or more_________(give number)

(15) Are the students in your classroom free to visit the library at times other than the regularly scheduled period or periods?

_________1. YES __________2. NO

(16-20) Has your school participated in any of the following reading related ac activities this year?

	YES	NO
1. A Book Fair	________	________
2. Reading Is Fun-Damental (RIF)	________	________
3. The Bookmobile program	________	________
4. The "Read More in "74" Campaign	________	________
5. Any other (Please list.)	________	________

VI. MATHEMATICS - (READING TEACHERS AND READING RESOURCE TEACHERS SKIP TO SECTION VII)

QUESTIONS 21-27 ARE FOR PUBLIC SCHOOL PERSONNEL ONLY. NON-PUBLIC PERSONNEL BEGIN ANSWERING THIS SECTION WITH QUESTION 28.

(21-25) Please check the Title I Competitive Partnership mathematics program used in your classroom this year and last year.

	This year	Last year
1. Addison-Wesley	___	___
2. D.C. Health	___	___
3. Random House	___	___

(26,27) Give the number of Title I students in your room this year who are using the same Competitive Partnership program they used during the 1972 - 1973 school year.______________

(28,29) Please check the month you started the Competitive Partnership Program this year and indicate when the reading books arrived for the students to use.

Month CP started		Month Mathematics Books Arrived	
___September	___February	___September	___February
___October	___March	___October	___March
___November	___April	___November	___April
___December	___May	___December	___May
___January		___January	

(30-35) If you did not receive your Competitive Partnership materials in September, with what mathematics materials were you supplied?

	PUBLISHER	TITLE OF SERIES
1.	____________________	____________________
2.	____________________	____________________
3.	____________________	____________________

(36) Did you have access to the materials this year which you used in the Competitive Partnership program for 1972 - 1973?

1.____YES 2. ____NO

(37-47) Please list the mathematics series and materials (other than the CP programs) that you use most often with your Title I students. Please check the one series which is your basal or adopted series.

TITLE	PUBLISHER	Basal Series
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		

(48-59) Who made the decision to use these mathematics materials listed above in your classroom? (Please check (✓) all that apply.

	Title I Program	Regular Program
1. Central Administration	____	____
2. School Administration	____	____
3. Title I Staff	____	____
4. Mathematics Resource Teacher	____	____
5. Both Mathematics Resource and the Classroom Teacher	____	____
6. Other (Specify) ______________________________	____	____

(60-65) On the average, how many minutes per week do you devote to each program?

1. ___________Regular Mathematics Program
2. ___________Title I Mathematics Program
3. ___________Total for Regular and Title I Programs

(66) Please check the one showing how you usually organize your Title I students for mathematics instruction.

_____ 1. Small groups (10 or less)

_____ 2. Large groups (more than 10)

_____ 3. Individualized

_____ 4. Other (Specify)____

Office Use only
Card 4, 1-7

(8-24) For the following list of teaching activities please check those that you use in teaching your Title I students. Next place a second check for the three activities that you use the most.

____ 1. Mathematics Vocabulary
____ 2. Computation Skills
____ 3. Number Presentation
____ 4. Numeration
____ 5. Sets
____ 6. Number Sentences
____ 7. Structure
____ 8. Operations
____ 9. Geometry
____10. Measurement
____11. Problem Solving
____12. Number Theory
____13. Probability and Statistics
____14. Application

(25) Do you keep an individual pupil profile book or form to indicate the student's competency in each skill area?

____ 1. on all Title I students
____ 2. on some Title I students
____ 3. on none

(26) Is your classroom well-equipped for teaching mathematics?

1.____YES 2.____NO

(27) Do your students have free access to use the manipulative media, devices, etc.?

1.____YES 2. ____NO

(28) Are the children in your classroom free to take their text books home for home assignments?

____YES ____NO

(29) Have you taken your class on a cultural enrichment field trip in relation to their mathematics program?

____YES ____NO

VII. EDUCATIONAL AIDES

(30,31) Do you have a teacher's aide assigned to your classroom?

1.____YES 2. ____NO

If YES, indicate on what time basis?

____Full-time ____Half-time ____Less than half-time

(32-38) Indicate below in ranking order the tasks which assign to your aide.

1. ____Preparation of instructional materials
2. ____Record maintenance
3. ____Supervising children to and from the classroom.
4. ____Individualized work with children
5. ____Equipment maintenance
6. ____Small group work with children
7. ____Others

(39,40) Is the aide sufficiently trained to carry out the tasks you assign to her/him?

1.____YES 2.____NO

If no, in what particular area is improvement needed?__________

____

(41,43) Have you and your aide attended together any type of staff development program designed to promote better team work?

1.____YES 2.____NO

If YES, did you find it beneficial? ____YES ____NO

If NO, would you be interested in attending such a program?

1____YES 2.____NO

(44-48) Please list and describe the major advantages you have encountered this year in working with the Title I Program

(49-53) Please list and describe the main problems you have encountered this year in working with the Title I Program.

VIII. INSTRUCTIONAL RESOURCE SERVICE

SECTION A (page 20) is to be answered by the Reading Resource Teachers only.

SECTION B (page 21) is to be answered by the Secondary Mathematics Teachers and Mathematics Resource Teachers only.

(54-67) Please rate the CP reading series currently used in your school in the above areas. Check the last column if you have No Observation (N.O.)

AREA	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	N.O.
1. The development of a sound value system					
2. The development of an appreciation and understanding of good literature					
3. The development of an appreciation and understanding of the pluralistic nature of American society.					
4. Presentation of vocabulary					
5. Style of art or graphic lay-out					
6. Size and style of print					
7. Specific lesson objectives					
8. Decoding activities					
9. Encoding activities					
10. Related language activities; i.e., creative writing discussions					
11. Enrichment activities; i.e., research projects, outside reading					
12. Adjustment to individual needs					
13. Audio-visual materials such as tapes, films, etc.					
14. Achievement and Placement Tests					

SECTION A: READING RESOURCE TEACHERS ONLY

Please rate the CP mathematics series currently being used in your school in the following areas. Indicate by letters NA if not applicable

(8-23)

Office use only
Card 5, 1-7

AREA	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Unsatisfactory
1. Behavioral objectives					
2. Student involvement					
3. Presentation of vocabulary					
4. Style of art or graphic lay-out					
5. Size and style of print					
6. Specific lesson objectives					
7. Presentation of numbers					
8. Manipulative media					
9. Problem solving techniques					
10. Chapter reviews and tests					
11. Supplementary materials					
12. Enrichment activities					
13. Adjustment to individual needs					
14. Audio-Visual materials, etc.					
15. Achievement and Placement Tests					
16. Teacher's Manual					

SECTION B: SECONDARY MATHEMATICS TEACHERS AND MATHEMATICS RESOURCE TEACHERS ONLY

APPENDIX A - 3. PAC QUESTIONNAIRE

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ESEA TITLE I EVALUATION
1973-74

(1)
(2,3,4)

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARENT MEMBERS OF THE PARENT ADVISORY COUNCIL (PAC)

Directions: Please answer each question by putting an "X" in the space given. Answer all questions as accurately as you can.

PART I: TELL US ABOUT YOURSELF

(5) Sex

___ 1. Male

___ 2. Female

(6) Age

___ 1. Under 20 years

___ 2. 21 - 30 "

___ 3. 31 - 40

___ 4. 41 - 50 years

___ 5. Over 50 years

(7) Highest grade completed

___ 1. 5th grade or less

___ 2. 6th or 7th grade

___ 3. 8th or 9th grade

___ 4. 10th or 11th grade

___ 5. 12th grade

___ 6. some college or other training after highschool

___ 7. B. A./B. S.

___ 8. M. A./M. S.

(8-35) Please complete this chart showing the grades your children are in and whether or not they are "Identified" Title I

GRADE	Number of Children	TITLE I? Yes	No
Pre-Kindergarten			
Kindergarten			
1st grade			
2nd grade			
3rd grade			
4th grade			
5th grade			
6th grade			
7th grade			
8th grade			
9th grade			
10th grade			
11th grade			
12th grade			

PART II: PAC PARTICIPATION

(36-39) PAC Membership

___ 1. Citywide PAC

___ 2. Regional PAC: PAC Region Number ________

___ 3. Local School PAC: Name of School ______________

(40) When did you first become a member of your local school PAC?

___ 1. June 1972 or earlier

___ 2. Between September 1972 and June 1973

___ 3. Between September and December 1973

___ 4. Since January 1974

(41) When did you first become a delegate of the Regional/Citywide PAC?

___ 1. Not a delegate

___ 2. June 1972 or earlier

___ 3. Between September 1972 and June 1973

___ 4. Between September and December 1973

___ 5. Since January 1974

(42-47) Participation in other parent groups and services. (Mark all that apply)

___ 1. Parent-Partners Volunteer Corps (formerly Parent Corps)

___ 2. Job Counseling and Placement Service

___ 3. TOPPS Chorus

___ 4. Title I Educational Aide

___ 5. Other (Please describe) ______________________________

____

(48-54) Are you now an officer of PAC at the local, regional or city-wide level?

___ 1. NO

___ 2. YES

If YES, check the office(s) you hold:

		Citywide	Regional	Local
(48)	Chairperson	___	___	___
(49)	Vice Chairperson	___	___	___
(50)	Recording Secretary	___	___	___
(51)	Assistant Recording Secretary	___	___	___
(52)	Committee Chairperson	___	___	___
(53)	Chaplain	___	___	___
(54)	Other (Please Describe) _______________	___	___	___

(55) Were you an officer of PAC before this year, either local or citywide?

___ 1. YES

___ 2. NO

(56) How many regional or citywide PAC meetings have you attended this school year?

___ 1. Not a delegate

___ 2. Two or less

___ 3. Three to four

___ 4. Five to six

___ 5. Seven to eight

___ 6. Nine to ten

___ 7. Eleven to twelve

(57) How many local school PAC meetings have you attended this school year?

___	1. Not a member	___	5. Seven to eight
___	2. Two or less	___	6. Nine to ten
___	3. Three to four	___	7. Eleven to twelve
___	4. Five to six		

PAC REGIONAL OFFICERS ONLY. ALL OTHER PAC MEMBERS, PLEASE SKIP QUESTION 58.

(58) Please rate the PAC Leadership Training Institute in terms of its usefulness to your work as a PAC member.

___	1. Very useful	___	3. Not useful
___	2. Somewhat useful	___	4. Did not attend

(59-64) How did you become a member of your school's PAC? (Mark an "X" on all that apply)

(59) ___ Elected in a parents' meeting at your child/children's school.

(60) ___ Asked to serve by another PAC member.

(61) ___ Asked to serve by your school's principal.

(62) ___ Asked to serve by some other school official.

(63) ___ Asked to serve by some of the parents in your neighborhood.

(64) ___ Other (Please describe) ______________________________

____

____

(65-69) How did you become a member of the regional or citywide PAC?

(65) ___ Elected by your school's PAC as the representative.

(66) ___ Asked to serve by another citywide PAC member.

(67) ___ Asked to serve by your school's principal

(68) ___ Asked to serve by some other school official

(69) ___ Other (Please describe) ______________________________

____

____

(70-75) What information was given to you as a member of PAC?
(Mark all that apply)

(70) ___ Federal program guidlines for Title I

(71) ___ School system plan of operation for Title I for 1973-74

(72) ___ Number of schools and children in these schools who would be, or are, receiving Title I services

(73) ___ Budget information on how much Title I money is being spent for various services, such as reading, medical assistance.

(74) ___ Other (Please describe) ______________________________

____

____

(75) ___ None

OFFICE USE ONLY:
Card 2, 1 - 6

(7-14) Have you and other PAC members in your school participated in making decisions about the following activities? (Mark all items.)

		YES	NO	NOT SURE
(7)	Selection of Title I Staff	___	___	___
(8)	Kinds of services actually provided to children	___	___	___
(9)	Determining the needs of children	___	___	___
(10)	Setting priorities based on the needs of children	___	___	___
(11)	Use of the Title I funds in your school	___	___	___
(12)	Evaluation of the Title I services in your school	___	___	___
(13)	Making changes in the Title I services	___	___	___
(14)	Other (Please describe)			

____

____

(15) Does the principal and/or a representative from the Title I office meet with you and other PAC members regarding Title I policies and services?

___ 1. Yes, regularly ___ 2. Yes, once in a while ___ 3. No

(16) Does the principal of your school work cooperatively with PAC members in meeting the Title I children's needs?

_____ 1. Yes, most of the time

_____ 2. Yes, once in a while

_____ 3. No

(17) Do the classroom teachers work cooperatively with PAC members in meeting the Title I children's needs?

_____ 1. Yes, most of the time

_____ 2. Yes, once in awhile

_____ 3. No

(18) Do the Pupil Personnel Worker and Pupil Personnel Aide work cooperatively with PAC Members in meeting the Title I children's needs?

_____ 1. Yes, most of the time

_____ 2. Yes, some of the time

_____ 3. No

(19) Do you and the other PAC members feel that you knew what your job is in helping to meet the needs of the Title I children in your school?

_____ 1. Yes, most of the time

_____ 2. Yes, some of the time

_____ 3. No

(20) Do parents tell you or other PAC members when they don't like something that happens to their children in school?

____ 1. Yes, frequently

____ 2 Yes, once in a while

____ 3 No, they don't tell me

(21 - 29) What does the Title I program mean to you as a PAC member? (Mark all of the following items that fit your opinion.)

____ (21) More jobs for parents

____ (22) More special services for your child/children, like hot lunches, clothing, medical assistance.

____ (23) Better teaching of reading

____ (24) Better teaching of mathematics

____ (25) More field trips for your child/children

____ (26) More decision-making for you and other parents over your child's/children's education

____ (27) Not sure

____ (28) No opinion

____ (29) Other (Please describe)________________________

____

____

____

(30) Do you feel that you are doing something important for your child/children and the other Title I children by serving as a PAC member?

___ 1 Yes

___ 2 No

___ 3 Not sure

(31 - 38) What changes in the Title I program services would you like to see happen? (Please describe) Use the back of this questionnaire if you need more space.

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

____

PART III: YOUR VIEW AS A PARENT

Directions: Please answer each question by putting an X in the appropriate space.

(39 - 43) Is your school doing a good job in teaching your child/children the following subjects?

(39)	Reading	___Yes	___No	___Not sure
(40)	Mathematics	___	___	___
(41)	Science	___	___	___
(42)	Social Studies	___	___	___
(43)	Other (Please describe	___	___	___

(44 - 51) Is your school doing a good job in providing your child/children with the following services?

(44)	Special tutoring in reading or mathematics	___Yes	___No	___Not sure
(45)	Food	___	___	___
(46)	Clothing	___	___	___
(47)	Medical attention	___	___	___
(48)	Field trips			
(49)	Special testing, like vision or hearing	___	___	___
(50)	Job preparation	___	___	___
(51)	Other (Please describe)	___	___	___

____

____

____

(52) In your opinion, how interested are the parents in your neighborhood in what the school is doing for their children?

___ 1. Most parents are interested

___ 2. Most parents are not interested

___ 3. No opinion

(53) How good a job do the parents in your neighborhood think the school is doing in teaching their children?

___ 1. Most parents think the school is doing a good job.

___ 2. Most parents think the school is not doing a good job.

___ 3. Most parents don't know.

___ 4. No opinion

(54) How much help do you give your child/children with school work (reading, mathematics, spelling, etc.)?

___ 1 A great deal

___ 2 Some

___ 3 Not very much

(55) To what extent do you talk with your child/children about doing well in school?

___ 1 A great deal

___ 2 Some

___ 3 Not very much

Thank you very much for taking the time to answer these questions. Your answers are very important to the evaluation effort.

PART IV

THE NEXT QUESTIONS ARE FOR REGIONAL AND CITYWIDE PAC DELEGATES ONLY.

ALL OTHERS PLEASE SKIP THESE QUESTIONS

(56 - 63) Do you and the other regional or citywide PAC members participate in making decisions about the following activities? (Mark all items)

		YES	NO	NOT SURE
(56)	Selection of Title I	___	___	______
(57)	Setting priorities for services based on the needs of children	___	___	______
(58)	Allocation of Title I funds for the priorities that have been set	___	___	______
(59)	Evaluation of the results of the Title I program	___	___	______
(60)	Recommending changes in the Title I program services based on results	___	___	______
(61)	Making changes in the Title I program based on the results	___	___	______
(62)	Sharing information with local shcool PAC'S	___	___	______
(63)	Other (Please Describe)	___	___	______

____

____

____

(64 - 72) Do the Title I staff and other school officials work cooperatively with you and other regional/citywide PAC members in the following activities? (Mark all items)

		YES	NO	NOT SURE
(64)	Providing Title I program guidelines	___	___	___
(65)	Providing Title I budget information	___	___	___
(66)	Mutually arriving at priorities for spending the Title I money	___	___	___
(67)	Providing evaluation reports	___	___	___
(68)	Providing information on various programs paid for by Title I money, like reading or mathematics	___	___	___
(69)	Planning the Title I program for each year	___	___	___
(70)	Making changes in the Title I program services based on the results with children	___	___	___
(71)	Setting the guidelines for determining the needs of the Title I children	___	___	___
(72)	Other (Please describe)	___	___	___

Thank you very much for taking the time to answer these questions. Your answers are very important to the evaluation effort.

APPENDIX A - 4. NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONALS' QUESTIONNAIRE

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ESEA TITLE I EVALUATION
1973-74

(1)

QUESTIONNAIRE FOR NON-TEACHING PROFESSIONALS
PUBLIC SCHOOLS ONLY

Directions: This questionnaire applies only to Title I ESEA programs. Please complete the questionnaire only if you spend 20% or more of your time with this program.

(2-5)

Name (Optional) ____________________

(6) Position:

___ 1. Social Worker
___ 2. Clinical Psychologist
___ 3. Pupil Personnel Worker
___ 4. Speech Therapist
___ 5. Other (Specify) ____________________ ____________________

(7) Highest degree held

___ 1. B.A./B.S.
___ 2. Masters degree
___ 3. Masters plus
___ 4. Doctorate
___ 5. Other (Specify) ____________________

(8,9) Years of experience in your professional field: ________ years

(10,11) Years of experience in working with Title I students: ________ years

(12,13) What percentage of your time was devoted to working with the Title I programs this year and last year?

	This Year	Last Year
1 . 21 - 40%	________	________
2 . 41 - 60%	________	________
3 . 61 - 80%	________	________
4 . 81% to full-time	________	________
5 . Not applicable last year		________

(14-16) Of the time that you spent with the Title I program this year (as indicated in the preceding question), about what percentage was spent with school personnel, students, or parents? (Columns 1 + 2 + 3 should add to about 100%)

Percentage of Time	School Personnel	Students	Parents
1. 20% or under	___	___	___
2. 21 - 40 %	___	___	___
3. 41 - 60%	___	___	___
4. 61 - 80%	___	___	___

(17) How many Title I schools do you work in or serve?

___ 1. One ___ 2. Two ___ 3. Three ___ 4. Four

___ 5. Five or more ___ 6. Do not work with specific schools

(18-27) Please list the Title I schools with which you work.

____

____

____

____

(28-39) Using a scale from 1-4, rate the items below in the first column according to the amount of time you spend on each task with 1 = "most frequent" and 4 = "least frequent." In the second column, rate the items in terms of how you feel you should spend your time.

	Usually	Should
(28,29) Planning and consultation with school personnel for problems and programs geared to many students	___	___

		Usually	Should
(30,31)	Referrals for assessment, testing or diagnosis of individual students	___	___
(32,33)	Post-assessment consultation with school personnel to discuss problems/diagnosis of individual pupils	___	___
(34,35)	Planning with and assisting school personnel and other professionals to develop treatment, therapy, or intervention programs for individual children	___	___
(36,37)	Consultations with parents regarding their children's problems	___	___
(38,39)	Home/community liaison and follow-up	___	___

(40) Considering your caseload, to what extent are you able to provide services to Title I students who are in need of them?

___ 1 Almost all who need them are served

___ 2 About half of those who need them are served

___ 3 Only a small number of those in need are served

(41) How adequate is the follow-through with Title I students to provide the treatment, therapy or intervention necessary to the amelioration of the original condition?

___ 1 Usually adequate ___ 3 Sometimes adequate

___ 2 Often adequate ___ 4 Rarely adequate

(42,43) Do you feel that your professional skills are well used in serving Title I students? _____ 1 YES _____ 2 NO

If NO, state how your skills can be better used.

____

____

(44-49) Please rate the cooperation you received from the following people in the Title I program. Mark the appropriate column.

		Excellent	Good	Poor	Not Applicable
(44)	Title I Coordinators	____	____	____	____
(45)	Principals	____	____	____	____
(46)	Resource Teachers	____	____	____	____
(47)	Classroom Teachers	____	____	____	____
(48)	Parents	____	____	____	____
(49)	Other (Specify)				
	____________________	____	____	____	____

(50-55) What percentage of the Title I students (and their parents) that you worked with this school year fall into the following pupil personnel case categories.

(50,51) I (most critical) ______%

(52,53) II ______%

(54,55) III (Least critical) ____%

(56 - 69) Given below are some problems often found among students. Please check all those that you have found among the Title I students that you have worked with. Double check the five that are most common.

(56) ___ Discipline
(57) ___ Lack of Motivation
(58) ___ Disruptive family conditions
(59) ___ Clothing
(60) ___ Poor nutrition
(61) ___ Need better self-image
(62) ___ Need an adult interest
(63) ___ Vision/need of eye glasses
(64) ___ Dental care needs
(65) ___ Physical Health/Other Problems
(66) ___ Speech
(67) ___ Reading retardation
(68) ___ Emotional problems
(69) ___ Social adjustment

(70) How interested are the parents of Title I students in their children's problems?

___ 1. Most parents are interested
___ 2. About half are interested
___ 3. Most parents are not interested
___ 4. Not applicable

(71,72) Please list and describe the major problems you have encountered in working with the Title I program. (Use back of questionnaire if needed)

(73,74) Please list and describe the major advantages you have encountered in working with the Title I Program.

(75,76) Please list and describe your recommendations for improvement of services to Title I students.

APPENDIX A - 5. NON-TEACHING PARA-PROFESSIONALS' QUESTIONNAIRE

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ESEA TITLE I EVALUATION
1973-74

(1) QUESTIONNAIRE FOR PARA-PROFESSIONALS

Directions: Please answer all questions unless indicated for a specific job title. Place a check (✓) in the respective spaces.

Name (optional)______________________________

(2,3) School Code______________________________

(4,5) School Name______________________________

(6) Position:

___ 1. Educational Aide
___ 2. Program Assistant
___ 3. Health Aide
___ 4. Pupil Personnel Aide
(7,8) ___ 5. Other (Please specify)
____

(9) Sex

___ 1. Female
___ 2. Male

(10) Age

___ 1. 20 years or younger
___ 2. 21 to 30 years
___ 3. 31 to 40 years
___ 4. Over 40 years

(11) How long have you been working in this school?

___ 1. Less than 6 months
___ 2. 6 - 12 months
___ 3. 13 - 18 months
___ 4. 19 - 24 months
___ 5. 25 - 30 months
___ 6. 31 - 36 months
___ 7. More than 36 months

(12,13) How many years have you been an aide in the D. C. School System ____ years

Please give the approximate amount of time per day you spend on each of the following (total should not be more than 8 hours):

(14,15) Working directly with students __________ hours

(16,17) Working on administrative and clerical duties (record keeping, processing forms, arranging trips, etc.) _________ hours

(18) Do you feel that your talents are well used at your school?

1. YES________ 2. NO________

(19-25) How would you rate the cooperation you received from the following people at your school? (Please check the appropriate column.)

	Excellent	Good	Poor	Not Applicable
(19) Principal	____	____	____	____
(20) Teachers	____	____	____	____
(21) Parents	____	____	____	____
(22) Nurses	____	____	____	____
(23) Psychologist	____	____	____	____
(24) Social Worker	____	____	____	____
(25) Speech Therapist	____	____	____	____

(26) Did you complete a questionnaire on which you indicated what training you needed and wanted?

____ 1. YES ____ 2. NO

(27) In your opinion how adequate is the "Total Team Approach" to staff training?

___ 1. Very Adequate ___ 2. Adequate ____ 3. Not Adequate

(28) How would you rate the overall staff development training that you have received this year?

___ 1. Excellent ___ 2. Good ___ 3. Fair ____ 4. Poor

(29-33) What recommendation(s) would you make for next year's Staff Development Training? (Check all that apply.)

___ (29) More Sessions

___ (30) Sessions attended by teachers

___ (31) Professional/Paraprofessional Interpersonal Relationships

___ (32) More Academic Content

___ (33) Other (Please specify)

____

____

(34-38) Please list any recommendations that you would like to see instituted for next year.

(34) ____

(35) ____

(36) ____

(37) ____

(38) ____

EDUCATIONAL AIDES ONLY: HEALTH AIDES AND PUPIL PERSONNEL AIDES SKIP TO QUESTION #65

(39) How many teachers are you assigned to?

___ 1. One ___ 2. Two ___ 3. Three or more

(40) Which of the following Competitive Partnership Reading Programs are you working with?

___ 1. D.C. Heath

___ 2. Random House

___ 3. McGraw-Hill

___ 4. None of the above

(41) Which of the following Competitive Partnership Mathematics programs are you working with?

___ 1. D.C. Heath

___ 2. Random House

___ 3. Addison-Wesley

___ 4. None of the above

(42) Do you actively participate in classroom planning with teachers?

___ 1. Always ___ 2. Sometimes ___ 3. Never

(43-52) Given below are problems often found among students. Please check the three that are common among the Title I students you have worked with.

___ (43) Discipline

___ (44) Lack of Motivation

___ (45) Disruptive Family Conditions

___ (46) Clothing

___ (47) Overcrowded Classroom

___ (48) Poor Nutrition

___ (49) Need Better Self-Image

___ (50) Need an Adult Interested in Them

___ (51) Other (Specify)

(52) ____________________

(53-63) In working directly with students, please check those items that describe the help that you give. (Put two checks beside those items that you do the most.)

___ (53) Read, tell or dramatize a story

___ (54) Write dictated story

___ (55) Prepare Worksheets

___ (56) Maintain instructional materials, supplies and equipment

___ (57) Order audio-visual materials

___ (58) Proctor examinations

___ (59) Prepare bulletin board displays

___ (60) Administer a teacher-made test

___ (61) Set up equipment for a reading, math science, or social studies activity

___ (62) Other (Please specify)

___ (63) ____________________

(64) Are you (or were you in the past) a parent of an identified Title I student(s)?

___ 1. YES ___ 2. NO

HEALTH AIDES AND PUPIL PERSONNEL AIDES ONLY:

(65) Approximately how many students did you assist in screening for vision, hearing, speech, weight and other health problems during the year?

____ 1. Less than 10	____ 4. 31 - 40
____ 2. 11 - 20	____ 5. 41 - 50
____ 3. 21 - 30	____ 6. 50 - 100
	____ 7. Over 100

(66-72) How many of the Title I students needing services have been referred to you in the following problem areas. (Use 1 = many, 2 = some, 3 = very few and 4 = don't know.)

(66) Visual_____	(69) Social/Psychological______
(67) Hearing____	(70) Nutritional ______
(68) Speech_____	(71) Other (Specify) _______
	(72) ____________________________

(73) What role do you play in the maintenance of student health records?

____1. Responsible for maintenance

____2. Assist in maintenance

____3. Other (Please specify)____

(74) How would you rate your work relationship with the professional Health Team?

1.______Good 2.______Fair 3.______Poor

APPENDIX B - 1 CLASSROOM & RESOURCE TEACHERS' INTERVIEW

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
E.S.E.A. TITLE I EVALUATION
1973 - 1974

Interview questionnaire for classroom teachers, reading resource teachers and mathematics resource teachers for public and non-public and non-public schools. The interviewer may modify items to simplify them to the interviewee and ask additional questions if necessary. Please feel free to use the back of any sheet for additional comments.

Name (optional)________________________________

School________________________Elementary______Secondary__________

Grade______Total number of years teaching experience with the Title I Program______

Public_________Non-public_________

Total number of identified Title I students in your classroom.________

INTRODUCTION

We are interested in obtaining professional information on the E.S.E.A. Title I Program for the 1973 - 1974 school year. We would like your opinion on the following:

I. General

1. What were and are some of the outstanding features of the 1973 - 1974 Title I Program?

pq1. List some of the things that you noticed this year that you didn't notice last year.

2. What were some of the problems you encountered with the Title I Program this year?

pq1. Where there any particular reasons for this?

pq2. Were they resolved? Yes______No______

pq3. If yes, how were they resolved?

II Staff Development

What is your understanding of the "total team approach" to Staff Development? (If unable to answer, skip to Section III on Instructional Programs.)

pq1. How did you and your aide benefit from this approach?

pq2. Would you cite specific examples?

pq3. Were there a few particular types of Staff Development sessions you found more beneficial than others? (List the three most important areas only.)

pq4. Were there a few special teaching methods in the Staff Development program you found more beneficial than others? (List the three most important areas only.)

III. Instructional Program

1. What diagnostic procedures were used in your classroom to measure the strengths and weaknesses of your students?

    1. Caldwell Pre-school Inventory __________
    2. Metropolitan Reading Readiness Test __________
    3. California Achievement Test __________
    4. California Test of Basic Skills __________
    5. Publishers Tests (Spell out) __________
    6. D. C. Criterion Reference Test __________ (Mathematics)
    7. D. C. Criterion Reference Test __________ (Reading)
    8. Others (Specify) __________

pq1. Did you supplement these tests with any other not required by the Competitive Partnership Program No_____Yes_____ If yes, specify.)

pq2. Why did you administer the supplemental tests?

2. How effective were the diagnostic procedures in determining each child's learning styles? (Interviewer explains, if necessary, such learning channels as audio, visual, tactile, audio-visual, etc.)

3. How did you group your students for reading and mathematics instructional activities?

pq1. Were there any differences in the grouping you did for the regular reading and mathematics classes in comparison with the Competitive Partnership reading and mathematics programs?

Yes______ No______

pq2. If yes, what were they?

4. What are some of the learning difficulties experienced by your students that you have noticed in this year's Competitive Partnership Program?

pq1. Please state how you adapted the program to the individual student's needs.

pq2. Would you like to see the Competitive Partnership Program continued? Yes_______No_______

pq3. What changes in the present Competitive Partnership Program would you recommend?

5. What techniques did you use in motivating your students?

pq. How successful were they?

1. by Regular District Public School Reading Lessons
2. by Regular District Public School Mathematics Lessons
3. by Competitive Partnership Reading Lessons
4. by Competitive Partnership Mathematics Lessons
5. by others (Specify)

6. What was your role in providing cultural enrichment experiences to your students?

7. What suggestions do you have for changing the Title I Program of your school?

____ Date____________________
Signature of the Interviewer

APPENDIX B - 2. PRINCIPALS' INTERVIEW

PUBLIC SCHOOLS OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
ESEA TITLE I EVALUATION
1973-74

PRINCIPALS' INTERVIEW

The interviewer may modify items to the interviewee and ask additional questions if necessary. DO NOT SUGGEST ANSWERS.

Principal's Name (Optional) ________________________________

School ________________________________ Elementary ___ Secondary ___

Non-Public ___

Total number of years administrative experience with the Title I Program _____

For the Current Year

Number of students _____ Number of support staff _____

Number of teachers _____ Number of parent volunteers _____

1. What are the major strengths of this year's Title I Program of your school? (List by priority)

____

____

____

____

2. What problems you have encountered in your school Title I Program this year?

____

____

____

____

3. How could these problems be eliminated or lessened?

4. Did you have any administrative problems in managing the Title I funds and programs this year? (State by priority)

5. What positive results have you noted of the local PAC this year?

6. What changes would you suggest?

7. What were some of the most productive Title I Staff Development activities of this year? Why?

8. What changes would you recommend for the overall Title I Staff Development Programs?

9. How good were the facilities and equipment at your school for the Title I Program operations?

10. What additional facilities and equipment would you recommend to carry out the Title I Program at your school in a more effective manner?

11. Did you have adequate Title I staff to do the Title I job?

12. If not, what additional Title I staff do you think you should have to do a more effective Title I job?

13. How well are they (your staff) cooperating to make the Title I program a success?

15. How were the PAC members recruited for your school?

16. To what extent have the PAC members been involved in making policy decisions concerning this year's Title I Program?

17. Do the parents of your students seem pleased with the Title I Program activities? (Explain)

18. If you could make changes in administering the Title I Program for next year, what changes would you make?

19. Was the Title I budget properly utilized at your school? (How to get better mileage out of the funds allocated?)

____

____

____

____

20. Do you have any final comments on the Title I Program, personnel, facilities, equipment or other areas that you haven't discussed so far?

____

____

____

____

____________________________ Interviewer's Signature	_______________ Date

APPENDIX B - 3. SPECIAL EDUCATION STAFF INTERVIEW

ESEA TITLE I EVALUATION
INTERVIEW SCHEDULE FOR PROFESSIONAL STAFF
SPECIAL EDUCATION LEARNING CENTER

The interviewer may omit those items not pertinent to a given individual selected for interviewing. The interview and observation will be conducted by the Senior Research Scientist of the project. All responses will be kept strictly confidential.

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

Center Name ______________________________

Name (Optional)______________________ Title ______________

Highest degree held____________ Major field ____________ Minor field ______

Years of experience in: Special Education ____________; Title I __________

No. of identified ESEA Title I children in the center/classroom____________

Total no. of children in the center/classroom ____________________

Categories 1-5 are for all professional staff interviewed; Category 6 is for project directors only.

II. CHILDREN BEING SERVED -- CHARACTERISTICS

1. Age range ______________________________
2. Number and/or per cent of children at each age level: 7_____, 8_____, 9_____, 10______.
3. Number of boys _____________ Number of girls _____________
4. Kinds of learning problems manifested e.g., behavioral acting out, visual-perceptual, limited academic ability, auditory-linguistic, er.

5. Magnitude of such problems on the average, e.g. moderate, severe. (Specify the actual problem before rating)

6. Any particular kinds of learning problems manifested more than others.

7. Home backgrounds in general, e.g., one-or two-parent families, economic status, similar problem(s) in siblings.

8. Number and/or per cent of children estimated to be able to return to the regular classroom without continuing supportive services.

III. REFERRAL PROGRESS AND TERMINATION MECHANISMS

1. Criteria for accepting a child into the center

2. Intake procedures
   1. Initial identification and referral, i.e., who is involved.

   2. Diagnostic work-up, e.g., who is involved, what testing and observational techniques are used, what role does the family play, etc.

   3. Decision-making process as to acceptance of the child into the center, i.e., who is involved and how is it handled.

4. Decision-making process as to the placement of a child into a particular classroom, i.e., who is involved and what are the basis.

3. Progress reporting or feedback procedures, i.e., what are the feedback techniques used by the center and/or the regular school to keep informed regarding a particular child's performance, who is involved, and how often does feedback occur.

4. General criteria for returning a child to the regular classroom setting on a full-time basis.

PQ 1. Differential criteria for particular kinds of learning problems.

2. Follow-up support of center program in regular classroom

3. Feedback on child's performance in the regular classroom.

3. PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS

1. Major differences between the center program and that of the regular classroom in such aspects as:

    1. Class size
    2. Materials and equipment
    3. Instructional techniques and classroom management
    4. Professional personnel
    5. Parent involvement
    6. Time allocations for reading, language, and math.
    7. Other

2. Description of the instructional process in mathematics, language, and perception.

    1. Typical types of activities in each of the three areas, including time distribution per day.

    2. Grouping basis.

3. Individualization

4. Use of para-professionals and parents.

5. Use of other professionals.

6. Other

3. Instructional materials -- description and evaluation

1. Mathematics

2. Language

3. Perception

4. Other

4. Role of non-teaching professionals in the overall program, including the amount of time spent.

1. Pupil Personnel Worker

2. Psychologist

3. Medical personnel

4. Resource teacher

5. Other

5. Outcomers of the program

1. Achievement records of children as measured by pre- and post-testing, e.g., average expectancy in regular classroom program in relation to mean gains achieved in center program.

2. Progress as reported by teachers, teacher aides, and parents

3. Coordination of information-sharing regarding the program offered to the children between regular classroom and center classroom.

4. Effects of non-categorical grouping on children's performance

5. Parental involvement in the educative process

6. Number of children returned to the regular classroom setting with:

   1. Follow-up supportive services

   2. No follow-up supportive services deemed necessary.

7. Other

4. STAFF DEVELOPMENT

1. Kinds of activities engaged in:

   1. Workshops/conferences for special education staff and regular school staff.
   2. Case conferences regarding a particular child or group of children.
   3. Presentation by non-teaching professionals (e.g., psychologist, medical doctor) regarding learning problems of various types.
   4. Demonstrations of materials and equipment.
   5. Other

5. ASSESSMENT OF SELCP

1. Outstanding features, e.g., program, staff, coordination, parental involvement, materials, budget allocation

2. Problems encountered

3. Suggested changes for improving the program services to children.

6. BUDGET (For Program Directors/Coordinators)

1. Sources of funds supporting SELCP, e.g., ESEA I, regular school budget etc.

2. Per cent of dollar contribution from each source on a per child basis

3. Average cost per child

4. Decision-making process with regard to program needs and operations, e.g., basic allocation of funds in various categories (personnel, materials) reprogramming, etc.

APPENDIX B - 4. ADMINISTRATORS' INTERVIEW

ADMINISTRATORS' INTERVIEW
E.S.E.A. TITLE I EVALUATION
1973 - 1974

This Interview Schedule is for the Title I coordinators, directors, assistant directors, superintendent of instruction, and other central office staff of the D.C. Public schools, who are directly connected with the E.S.E.A. Title I programs of 1973-74.

BASIC DATA

Name (optional) ______________________

Sex Male ________ Female ________

Position ______________________
(Exact Title)

Number of years involved in the Title I Program ________________

Number of years at the present position ________________

Number of staff supervised: Full-time Staff ________ Part-time Staff ________

Teacher ________ Non-Teaching Professional Staff ________ Parents ___

PAC Members ________

1. What are the specific responsibilities you have in the DCPS Title I Program?

2. How did you carry out those responsibilities this year? (Narrate the events as best you can recall.)

3. How did you plan for this year's Title I Program activities?

4. Do you feel that the planning process was effective? Yes_____ No_____
If yes, why? If no, why not? (Explain)

5. How did you set priorities for the Title I Program? Who assisted you in setting the priorities?

6. What were the priority areas?

7. Now that the school-year has ended, do you feel that those priorities were met?

Yes ________ No ________ To what extent? (Explain)

8. How did you assess the effectiveness of your program unit? (Please specify the techniques used - Interviewer explains if necessary)

9. In your opinion, what were the strengths of your program?

10. In your opinion, what were the weaknesses of your program?

11. What changes would you recommend based upon your own assessment?

12. What changes, if any, in these criteria for the identification of Title I students would you recommend?

13. How did you select the staff for Title I program? (Specify the recruitment method(s). (Professionals, para-professionals, PAC members, Secondary School Resource Teachers, etc.)

14. Considering the requirements of the U. S. Office of Education guidelines and the necessity of the school system to adhere to them, are you satisfied with the present criteria for selecting Title I schools? Yes_____ No_____
If No, what additional criteria would you recommend?

15. What was the extent of cooperation you received from your staff in successfully carrying out your program this year?

16. What was the extent of the cooperation you received from other Title I and administrative staff?

Cooperation from the superintendent's office?

17. What were some of the most significant staff Development Training Programs you coordinated this year? (Interviewer ask for any evaluation reports of the Staff Development Activities)

How did you enhance the "total team approach" in Staff Development

18. Were the Title I funds expended according to the plans you proposed for your area? Yes _______ No _______ (If no, explain how they were expended.)

19. What changes if any, would you recommend in the allocation of funds for next year? (Ask for priority areas)

20. What is your overall impression about the Title I Project in view of its set objectives?

21. How often have you visited the Title I schools/program activities/projects centers/other special interest areas, during 1973-74?

22. What general/specific recommendations do you have for the Title I Project for next year? (Approach from your program area.)

23: Do you have any additional comments?